DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 949 LI 003 703

AUTHOR	Jones, Virginia Lacy, Ed.
TITLE	Library Education in the South: Papers Presented at a Conference (3rd., The Emory University Division of Librarianship, April 20-22, 1967)
SPONS AGENCY	Atlanta Univ., Ga. School of Library Services.; Rockefeller Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	80p.; (14 References)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Conferences; Evaluation; Librarians; *Library Cooperation; *Library Education; *Library Schools; *Library Services; *Personnel Needs; Regional Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Librarianship; Southeastern Library Association

ABSTRACT

The major purpose of the Conference was to bring together the persons who are primarily responsible for the development of library education and library service in the South to assess the programs of library education at all levels in terms of the educational, social, economic, scientific and technological changes in society which must be served by changing patterns of librarianship. The conference participants were divided into four groups to discuss in some depth and to make recommendations relative to: (1) library personnel needs, (2) educational and/or training needs of library personnel, (3) types of specialization of major concern to the library profession and (4) regional cooperation among library schools, library science departments, state library agencies and associations, and the Southeastern Library Association. The conference concluded with the adoption of a resolution to request the Southeastern Library Association to establish a Council on Regional Planning for Library Education. (Author/NH)

ED 063949

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LIBRARY EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH

Papers Presented at a Conference

Sponsored by

The Atlanta University School of Library Service

With the Cooperation of

The Emory University Division of Librarianship

April 20-22, 1967

Edited with an Introduction by

VIRGINIA LACY JONES

Atlanta University
School of Library Service
Atlanta, Georgia
1969

LI 003 703

Contents

INTRODUCTION iv
Virginia Lacy Jones

REGIONAL PROBLEMS RELATED TO LIBRARY EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH 1
John Cory

PROBLEM AREAS IN LIBRARY EDUCATION 21
Jack Dalton

THE ROLE OF THE ALA OFFICE FOR LIBRARY EDUCATION . . . 34
Lester Asheim

REPORTS OF DISCUSSION GROUPS 46
1. Personnel
2. Education
3. Specialization
4. Cooperation

CONFERENCE SUMMARY 59
Sarah R. Reed

PROGRAM 66

APPENDIX 70
A Regional Plan for Library Education by Louis Shores

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 72

Introduction

The Conference on Library Education in the South was held at Atlanta University, April 20-22, 1967. This was the third in a series of conferences made possible by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. The three conferences were designed to contribute to strengthening education in the South through the improvement of library service.

The first conference on "The Role of the Library in Improving Education in the South," was held in April, 1965. The second conference dealt with "Materials by and about American Negroes," and was held in October, 1965. The third conference on "Library Education in the South," proposed to bring together representatives from graduate library schools; undergraduate library science departments; junior colleges offering programs for the training of library technicians; and state library agencies, as well as professional school, public, academic and special librarians. The 110 participants were from nine Southeastern states and Louisiana. The speakers and consultants were among the nation's foremost leaders in library education and librarianship.

The major purpose of the Conference was to bring together the persons who are primarily responsible for the development of library education and library service in the South to assess the programs of library education at all levels in terms of the educational, social, economic, scientific and technological changes in society which must be served by changing patterns of librarianship. The Conference also proposed to lay the foundation for future regional planning for library education and research in the South.

The opening sessions were devoted to discussions of regional problems related to library education, the identification of problem areas in library education, and the role of the new ALA Office of Library Education. The Conference participants then divided into four groups to discuss in some depth and to make recommendations relative to (1) library personnel needs; (2) educational and/or training needs of library personnel; (3) types of specialization of major concern to the library profession; and, (4) regional cooperation among library schools, library science departments, state library agencies and associations, and the Southeastern Library Association.

Throughout the Conference it was pointed out that the Southern region does present some unique characteristics that affect librarianship and library education; however, these unique characteristics are gradually changing and the major problems in library education and library service are increasingly more common to those of the nation as a whole.

The Conference concluded with the adoption of a resolution to request the Southeastern Library Association to establish a Council on Regional Planning for Library Education. It was recommended that such a council would seek financial support to establish a Southeastern Development Center for Library and Information Science which would provide leadership and guidance based upon scientific research in the development of various levels of library education programs from the junior college library technician level to doctoral programs; the articulation of specialization in multi-media and information science programs; the overall improvement of existing library education programs, and the establishment of new ones; and, regional coordination of continuing education programs such as workshops, institutes, and short courses. Such a center would also be concerned with recruitment, the stimulation of cooperative programs among various types of libraries in the region, and in the promotion of relationships with governmental and non-governmental agencies.

The Atlanta University School of Library Service is most grateful to the Rockefeller Foundation for its financial support of the series of conferences. Appreciation is expressed to the faculty, staff and students of the Atlanta University School of Library Service and of the Emory University Division of Librarianship for their cooperation in planning and conducting the program. We are especially grateful to the speakers, consultants, discussion group leaders and recorders, and participants for their presentations of meaningful analyses of problems and their challenging recommendations in specific areas of concern to this Conference. Very special thanks are expressed to Bro-Dart, Inc., and their representative, Mr. Robert Woodbury, for providing a most delightful social hour, enjoyed by the Conference participants.

Virginia Lacy Jones

Regional Problems Related to Library Education in the South

John Cory
Deputy Director
The New York
Public Library

It is a pleasure to be here in Atlanta working with you, talking with you and discussing some of our common problems. I feel very much at home here, and it is indeed a great honor to be invited to be with you on this occasion.

It has been my experience that a Northerner speaking in the South is expected to be—but rarely is—polite and uncritical. A Southerner will, of course, always be polite but he is also allowed to be critical. Whether you consider me a Southerner because I was born here and worked here, or a Northerner because I now live and work there, I hope, in any case that, you will consider my remarks to be polite, and I will also reserve the privilege of being at least mildly critical.

I never know whether I am a Northerner or a Southerner because I always think of Miss Mary Gorgas, and many will remember her at the University of Alabama. Miss Mary was Assistant Director of Libraries at the University of Alabama when I went there in 1940, although she had retired as librarian the year I was born. She didn't correspond with the Pennsylvania members of the Gorgas family because they had gone North and were beyond hope.

My story about Miss Gorgas and the South relates to Eugene Jackson, who is now the Chief Library Officer of International Business Office Machines, whom I brought down from Illinois to serve as Assistant Reference Librarian on the University of Alabama's Library Staff. Gene was a very polite and nice person and a very competent librarian and got along very well with Miss Mary until the inevitable day when she came to my office and said, "Mr. Cory, where is Mr. Jackson from?" I had made every effort to staff the University of Alabama's Library with the people with Southern connections, but it was a time of considerable expansion, and I had to confess that Mr. Jackson came from Illinois, and I said southern Illinois hoping that she would understand. And Miss Mary said, "Oh, too bad and he seemed like such a nice boy." That was the end of Mr. Jackson. I just want to make clear that I have lived in the South, that I am somewhat understanding and

sympathetic of Southern problems and that I am a great admirer of the Southern library spirit, which seems to me to have been unusually zealous in helping the nation to solve many of its library problems, including those of the South.

Actually, recent reflection and research, supplementing continuing observation and involvement over a number of years, leads me to the general opinion that the regional characteristics distinguishing the South from other areas of the country have sharply diminished and the problems and opportunities of education in librarianship for the South of the future will not be significantly different from the overall national problems and opportunities. I do not mean to ignore some continuing differences, many of them locally cherished — even painfully cherished — but most of my remarks here would be generally applicable elsewhere. This observation, whether well-founded or not, is intended to be a compliment and to represent a unifying attitude. It is also intended to give me an excuse to talk a little about New York library developments and their possible application in the South. Of course, "the South" still continues to be a somewhat separate "state of mind," as one of your earlier conferences indicates; however the regional gap is closing significantly — and what is generally not understood is that it is closing from both directions. The primarily agrarian, underdeveloped and divided South is obviously changing rapidly and inevitably. The revolutions in communications, of which the library is properly a part, the mobility of the population, and the high cost of supporting social services — all these are inexorably moving the South away from many of its distinctive regional patterns.

This point was effectively made in your 1965 conference when Dr. Lawrence Durisch said, and I quote:

> An examination of major economic and social trends indicates, however, that the South is moving nearer to conformity to the national pattern. This is true in income, in employment, in the racial characteristics of the population, and in population increase and its distribution between urban and rural areas. This emphasizes the fact that national forces dominate economic developments throughout the whole of the United States and will eventually dominate social and cultural developments as well. This does not mean that there is not room for regional

> differences and local emphases, but the main stream of American life is increasingly national — not sectional or regional.[1]

Often unrecognized is the concurrent fact that the rest of the country is also changing and that many of its changes bring it closer to some of the traditional problems of the South. Population mobility has brought to the North, for instance, substantial problems of *de facto* racial segregation which the North is facing in many ways less effectively than the South. The high cost of social services had inevitably been accompanied by taxpayer resistance increasing in the North. Even the inexorable tide of human progress, moving with power that often seems to be beyond human control, has led to many parallels to Southern frustration, the attempted withdrawal from the inevitable, and the blind adherence to reactionary forces. Future demographic changes should lead to greater national homogeneity, greater exchange of problems, and, hopefully, to greater mutual understanding and sympathy. There will remain certain regional imbalances particularly in the area of resources, including library resources. And there are many longstanding handicaps that will be slow to overcome. Economic progress in the South is extremely rapid, but the gap is hard to close because of rapid progress elsewhere too. And educational deficiencies require generations to correct.

I quote from a recent clipping in the *New York Times* on this question of the problem of running fast to stay in the same place.

> In terms of the average annual appropriation per student, the [*Southern*] region has kept pace, but it may never catch up because there is no ceiling to halt the national spiral. . . In the last eight years, the average annual per-student expenditure in the South has risen from $653 to $859. The South is now spending more per student than the nation was eight years ago, but regional expenditures remain in roughly the same position—about 92 per cent relative to national expenditures.[2]

This shows how difficult it is despite the tremendous progress being made in the South to eliminate some of the past deficiencies espe-

---

[1]Lawrence Logan Durisch, "The South Defined in Relation to Social, Economic, and Cultural Aspects," in *Proceedings of the Conference on The Role of Library in Improving Education in the South, April 8-10, 1965*, edited by Hallie Beachem Brooks (Atlanta: Atlanta University School of Library Service, 1965) p. 18.
[2]*New York Times*, February 12, 1967, p. 51.

cially in the area of education. There will also, certainly, be a continuing regional flavor that will assuredly keep many aspects of the South distinct from other regions. For example, recent projections indicate that in thirty or forty years, nearly ninety per cent of the national population will live in urban metropolitan areas. One great megalopolitan triangle will exist in the North, with its three points in Chicago, Boston, and Washington. A second great metropolitan complex will substantially blanket the entire state of California. The third great projected metropolitan concentration will be in the South focussing on Florida, and certainly all of us would agree that this urban region will have its own special characteristics, its own special achievements and its own special problems.[3] It will, among other things, lack the tradition of metropolitan operations which has existed in the Northern metropolitan areas. The Northern metropolitan areas will have just as difficult a time adjusting to megalopolitan living, but I am certain that the South will put its own special imprint on its own major metropolitan area as it develops. You are living in that area right now. During the lifetime of most of you this will become one of the great metropolitan areas of the country, difficult as it is to believe that. Differences, good and bad, will not disappear then, but my first main point is that these differences will not require essentially different regional patterns of library service and that education for librarianship faces more common problems nationally than it faces different problems regionally.

My second, perhaps more important, point is that while the *future* libraries for which we must prepare librarians, may not differ essentially on a regional basis, they *will* differ, nationally, from *present* libraries and these differences will be so great as to obscure almost all regional differences. I should like then to discuss for a few minutes the kinds of libraries which we may expect, or at least some of the possible future alternatives. The fact that these patterns may not be distinctively regional does not make them any less important to you as you gather on a regional basis to discuss them. Here, I must presume on you by describing some developments in New York State, not because they are necessarily applicable in the South, or even because they may be desirable and cer-

[3]Monroe C. Neff, "A Sound Environment for an Evolving Social Institution," in *Proceedings of the Conference on The Role of the Library in Improving Education in the South, April 8-10, 1965, op. cit.*, p. 6.

tainly not because they are easily achieved, but because, regardless of where I lived or worked, as a librarian I would have to conclude, that many of these New York developments indicate probable future patterns that we must learn to live with and if we like them, we must learn to work for.

First, a note on financing of the New York pattern. I always hate to talk dollars because it seems that New York has unusual financial resources and it always worries and frustrates people in other parts of the country when they learn about the kind of money that is being put into libraries in New York State. Yet, I am firmly convinced that it is this infusion of state money that has lead to the establishment of what I believe to be some future patterns of library service and operation. Until throughout the country we can tap the kind of fiscal resources which New York State has been applying to its libraries, I do not believe we can have good library service in the circumstances which are developing for our own future. New York now pays something like $15 million dollars a year in state aid for public libraries alone. This is several times the total amount of state aid given by all the other states in the country. This figure approaches and very shortly will reach one dollar per capita in state aid to public libraries. This is a fairly recent development of the last ten to fifteen years, and it affected New York at a time when New York was by no means a leader in the development of public library services. Libraries in New York were small and inadequate, and not willing to work together, and not anxious to have state control and to conform to state standards — all of the typical characteristics of the independent public library as it has developed in this country. But the very substantial amounts of state aid which were achieved with the help of library trustees, citizens, legislators, as well as librarians, had a startling effect. The bribe was large enough to bring together libraries all over the state in a cooperative system which had never been seen before that time.

As it stands at present, the entire state of New York with some sixty-eight counties is served by twenty-two multi-county public library systems entirely serving the state. These libraries receive not only actual dollar grants but receive book assistance from the state and are currently organized into a state-chartered non-profit corporation which within a very few years will be doing centralized acquisition and cataloging work for all of the public library systems in the state, with the preparation of a state-wide and regional

union book catalog for all public library acquisitions. All of these library systems are linked together by a teletype network. Extremely active inter-library loan activities are being carried on and in effect New York thus has a state-wide system of public library service.

I might say here that this kind of achievement, while it can rarely be accomplished in other individual states, can in my opinion, be accomplished on an inter-state basis in some parts of the country; and it would be well worthwhile, however long the task might take or however ridiculous it might seem, to undertake it. It seems to me that it would be well worthwhile for the Southern states to start moving in the direction of this type of integrated library system for the entire Southern region. With pooled resources available in the South, it will certainly make such a development possible. It will take many years, it took many years in New York State, and times are changing rapidly; we do not have many years. But it would be important to start to apply your very considerable zeal and planning skills to work in some direction like this.

Parallel with the development of public library systems and with the very considerable help in this instance of federal funds, the development of school library systems has also progressed in New York State so that the number of elementary school libraries in New York City, for example, has grown from about four 10 years ago to over 400 now in New York City alone. And this is typical of the developing patterns in schools at all levels throughout the state. There is a revolution going on in school library service; and the next step in state library development in New York State, and one that is most certainly applicable in the South and especially needed, it seems to me, is the development within the past four or five years of a movement toward cooperation among different kinds of libraries on a regional basis. In New York State this is confusingly called the state 3-R's Program, standing for Reference and Research Resources. And the state is now organized into nine multi-county regions for reference and research cooperation. The agency of which I serve as Executive Director and which is called *Metro* for short, is one of nine agencies that completely blanket the state to bring together on a cooperative basis school libraries, public libraries, college libraries, special libraries, university libraries and other kinds of reference and research library facilities so that this is a system of systems on a state wide basis. The patterns that are being developed

10

in intertype library cooperation in New York State have much to offer to other states and to other regions.

As our experimental period concludes, I hope there will be more in print and more publicity available about this development so that libraries in the other parts of the country can see if there are any parts of this pattern that may be applicable to them. I am always hesitant about suggesting that a pattern that is working in one place may be applicable in another. Mr. Robert Gitler will sympathize with the fact that when I was in Japan a number of years ago serving as a public library consultant and teaching at his library school, I was modest enough when I arrived to say that I was not there to tell them how things should be done; but I hoped perhaps some of our mistakes might be of interest to them so that they could avoid them. I thought that this was a perfectly appropriate course of action to take. I had not been there too long, however, when I discovered that some of our mistakes might be their proper successes. By the time I left, I was of the opinion that only locally devised solutions would possibly work, that the transferability of some of our successes and some of our failures was not applicable to a different situation. I, therefore, am not at all certain that any patterns that have been developed in other parts of the country are applicable to the South or should be adopted by the South. But I think that they might well be studied and adopted or not on the basis of their operations. Local indigent patterns might be developed that would serve to bring together all the libraries of the state or perhaps all the libraries of the region on a cooperative basis.

A few more words about New York and then I will return to the more general aspects of the type of librarianship for which we must be training future librarians. The agencies that I have described of cooperation among the reference and research libraries are not merely associations of individuals; they are state-chartered educational corporations and the institutions within the regions are the affiliates of these agencies. For example, the nearly fifty institutions that are affiliated with *Metro* possess in their cataloged collections twenty-five million volumes. This is a tremendous pooling of reference and research resources; and it is not an easy achievement to accomplish anywhere because these libraries are competitive, restrictive, mostly privately supported libraries that have not been accustomed to working together on a cooperative basis. But they have come together; they are beginning to be linked by modern commu-

nications devices and delivery services and an inter-library clearing house established with the opportunity for the affiliates of *Metro* to call an experienced reference librarian at any time to say, "I have a patron here who wants thus and so. We do not have it. Where can I find it?" Insofar as published resources or field visit information can answer these questions, we will have it available, we will know the restrictions on use, the hours of service, the names of the key individuals, and in many cases a good deal of information about the actual resources of the library. This is accomplished without the traditional union catalog and I am glad that this pattern comes along after, in effect, the days of union catalogs because we will be able to institute very flexible methods for determining the resources of the libraries of the region and will be working toward the day when the total resources of the New York Metropolitan Region, in terms of library and other types of data providing services, will be available through central computer sources accessible by remote consoles in every library of the region. This is a dream a long time off but there are some quite dramatic present activities. For example, I mentioned that all of the public library systems of the state and many other libraries are linked in the state-wide teletype network. The state program has this year gone into an experimental state-wide inter-library loan network, and the state has made contracts with a number of large public library systems and with eleven book subject referral centers so that a user of any library of any kind in the state wishing material on inter-library loan may borrow it from anywhere in the state at state expense. For example, the New York Public Library, the Research Library, formerly called the Reference Department, has been designated as the subject referral center for about half of fifty-five major subject areas that have been identified as needing coverage.

As a backstop ultimate source of location, the materials from the research libraries of the New York Public Library will for the first time be made available anywhere in the state in photo copy and microform, rather than by inter-library loan. But in most of the other libraries involved, the actual volume itself will be loaned; and this is set up on a very elaborate communication system to provide rapid location and delivery of the items needed. In fact, this state-wide system is capped by a fourteen-station telefacsimile network blanketing the state so that five of the largest

12 Ct

libraries in the state have tele-facsimile transmitting equipment and another group of eight or ten have tele-facsimile receiving equipment. So that within twelve hours, relatively small periodical articles or brief pamphlet materials can be located and transmitted by tele-facsimile. It only takes six minutes per page to transmit the paper copy of the item, but the process of relaying the request, of searching for and locating the item, and of preparing it for transmission means that our goal is to get it into the hands of the person requesting the item within twelve hours. You have done experimental work in the South along precisely these lines. I was interested in talking with Mrs. Dorothy Crosland this morning about some of her experiences at Georgia Tech.

This is technically feasible, it is expensive, it requires either state or national governmental support or industrial support; but it is perfectly possible and it has the chance of revolutionizing not only library service but the image of library service. I am constantly struck by the reaction of the students to information transfer and information networks on a regional or national basis; I am constantly struck by their doubt that librarians can play a major role in such an information revolution. They constantly say libraries in their traditional and conventional methods are not prepared to undertake this kind of information transfer and this is perfectly true. But they do not incorrectly draw from this lack of readiness the conclusion that libraries should not be involved or might not even wish to be involved in the development of a national system of information transfer. It seems to me that libraries need not stick to their conventional and traditional methods and that they must not stick to them if they wish to participate in the national systems of communicating and distributing knowledge which are already technically feasible and which are beginning to be financed and tested. Ultimately, of course, this type of program is going to require millions of dollars. And I should like to startle you, as no group, I think, can better stand to be startled than my friends from the South, by proposing a national program.

This is the second time I have made this proposal. I tried it in Minnesota one time and it fell flat there; but I am sure that you have greater vision and leadership in the South, so I would like my friends in the South to work toward the establishment of an annual one-hundred-million-dollar program of state support for libraries. This is, of course, a startling sum. But you will remember

that the Jacqueline Winslow national plan for libraries proposed that federal funds be available for fifteen per cent of the total of public library cost, state funds for twenty-five per cent, and local funds for sixty per cent. Only New York State at the moment approaches the proposed level or percentage of state support. But if one state can do it, then there seems to be no reason for not trying to reach this level of state support on a national basis. My rough estimate is that the percentage of public library support alone would amount to something like one hundred million dollars annually. This is not intended merely to put you into the blue sky area and say "Well, if that is the extent of the need, we might as well relax because we will never get there and there is no point in working toward it." It is intended to help you to realize that the magnitude of our library problem is such that it cannot ever be solved exclusively by our local efforts and by our local funds; and that we must, therefore, raise our eyes to different horizons and look for massive support for libraries in order to achieve the revolution that is available and possible. If we choose not to make this effort or if we try and fail, this would be an honorable effort; we will have a very different type of library future than we would have if we can come even close to this type of system of support, this multiple support for multitype library cooperation. It seems to me that it is worth the effort because we stand the risk, if we do not make this effort and succeed, of being passed over at almost every level and in almost every type of library service in favor of groups which have either more vigor or more political effectiveness or in one way or another are able to get these massive sums of money; because, make no mistake about it, this amount of money, and many times this amount of money, is going to be spent at the state and national level in the very field in which we are involved. I can state this with considerable assurance. I cannot, of course, know what share of this money will be spent by libraries. It seems to me that it is up to us to determine within the next generation what part of this mammoth activity we are going to be engaged in. I think you can see that the significance for education for librarianship thus has a tremendous range from a diminishing system of education of decreasing importance in our economy and in our society to one at the opposite extreme, a central, even a directing role in a massive program of state and national effort and financial expenditure.

The problem that I see as developing from this type of approach and even on an inadequate scale, if we do not make this approach, is a pattern somewhat different from that which we have at present. Although in the South much of this has been worked toward and achieved, I want to put it into proper perspective so that you will be able to see clearly the kinds of librarians that I believe we must be preparing. The different levels of library service and the different contexts of library operations that we can expect to have will require the preparation, of more than one type of librarian. First of all, we will have local libraries. This is what we have concentrated on. We have worked to extend and to develop local libraries. Library extension work over a period of the past forty or fifty years has been an object of true missionary zeal on the part of all of our librarians, most especially in the South, and the making available of local library outlets has been a major success of the profession. We have necessarily had to concentrate on quantity, however, rather than on quality. I would iike to comment a little on the need for improved quality of local libraries and a little on the kinds of services that they will render.

On the general question of quantity versus quality, I would like to quote Dr. Louis Round Wilson, who said a number of years ago, "The Southern educational leaders have had to deal first with the quantitative aspects of education rather than with the qualitative." In thinking about the future of education in the South, it would seem that the time has come when the qualitative as well as the quantitative should receive increasing consideration. I am certain that we offer lip service to the need for improving the quality of local libraries, and I am not here referring only to local public libraries, but also to any library which directly and immediately serves its constitutency or community on a face-to-face basis. I am sure we would all like to see the quality of such libraries improved. It is now necessary for us to focus our attention on precisely that point of improving quality. There will always be local needs that must be met on a local basis, that cannot benefit from the proposed national information network and information transfer systems and even the technology. There will always be in any local library people whose needs are immediate and whose needs are sometimes not exactly expressed so that they are dependent upon what they find, what they can take off the shelves, what is immediately available for use, what the local staff can enable them to find for their direct use.

This local librarianship in school libraries, in college libraries, in public libraries, and notably in special libraries is going to have to be increasingly hand tailored; individual prescriptions for the particular request presented by the library user distilled through the professional skill of the librarian so that the relationship between the reader's needs and the resources available locally can be met on a truly creative basis. This is not an easy task.

The librarian of the small local library or library outlet has always seemed to me to have the most difficult job in all of librarianship. He has to be a jack of all trades, he has to have a degree of thoughtfulness, in both senses of the term, that will enable him to put himself in the place of his user with the greatest imagination, and usually with inadequate resources locate materials in the immediately available collection for the needs of his particular local users. These local libraries will serve one or two purposes. They will either support the formal instructional program of an academic institution — secondary school, elementary school, or college — or they will lead to informal self-assisted education and pleasure. If the functions of libraries can be divided into joy, understanding, and knowledge, it is these local libraries that are going to be responsible for the dissemination of understanding and of joy in their use. Knowledge, we will come to later; it fits directly into the national information and technological revolutionary aspects of librarianship.

But how important is it for us to be able to improve the quality as well as the number of local outlets in order to support the formal educational program and in order to provide a measure of joy and understanding to the users of these local libraries? Each such local library must increasingly become, however, in addition to these important local services, a locater outlet as a part of a national network. In other words, in addition to those people who can be served best or only served by immediate access to locally available materials, every local library will run into some potential users who need materials not available locally and which could not reasonably be expected to be available locally. Hence each such outlet must become a locater in a national network. There must be almost instantaneous access to whatever kinds of information or copies of text or whatever data may be required available to the user of any local outlet in any kind of library. Obviously, the network itself, which this assumes, is beyond the resources of any of these local li-

braries to finance themselves and it is in this area that state and federal financing will be most necessary. In addition to the strictly local libraries with carefully selected materials to meet their assumed local needs, there will be a group of intermediate libraries of varying sizes and types which will serve both as local libraries and as parts of the national network. There will be a string of perhaps one hundred general research libraries and several hundred highly specialized research libraries which will be the backstopping libraries for this proposed national network.

We have to have acronyms and nicknames for many of our activities and it has been my pleasure for the purposes of this paper to call the possible national information network, a Data Locating System. It seems to me that the sooner we can get these initials DLS firmly established in the minds of the information seekers of the country, the more our preeminence in this network is going to be accepted. We are going to have to fit into some kind of a data locating system on a national basis.

As Mr. Monroe C. Neff said at your first conference, "We face, libraries face, the South faces a network of problems."[4] The only solution to that is a network of libraries and related information agencies to meet these problems; and this is going to affect the kind of librarian you are to be training in the future. This, in effect, is a whole new type of library extension in my opinion. I have always been addicted to library extension. I grew up in the period of geographic extension along with many of you; participated in the revolutions in educational extension, in the use of audio-visual materials in libraries, the developing use of radio and television in libraries, so that now added to the geographic extension movement within libraries and the educational extension movement within libraries, we face a research extension movement — the extension of the resources of all reference and research data agencies to any user of any kind of library. There must, however, be some ground rules. The best that I can propose is that all needed information must be within reasonable reach. The reach will have to be longer for some users than for others and for some kinds of materials than for other kinds of materials. It is essential, for example, that the formal instructional programs supply the bulk of their required supporting library ma-

[4] *Ibid.*

terials in their local libraries and turn to the longer reach only for highly significant materials or materials that are totally unavailable for local acquisition or for the extremely exceptional person, the gifted person who needs materials beyond any reasonable local opportunity to provide.

This means that the local and intermediate libraries have to be selective on the basis of their potential users and their needs, and that the national network has to be inclusive, and that the time it takes to get material, the cost that can be expended on getting the material rapidly, will vary from user to user and from need to need. Hence the scientist engaged in critical national research may require, or we may be justified in paying for him, telefacsimile transmission over very large areas. The student who wants supplementary materials for a school paper may have to be satisfied with materials that are more reasonably and economically available at his local and intermediate libraries. We must make an effort to meet these varying needs of our varying users through whatever device we have. I have mentioned the gifted as among the group that will be needing and might be entitled to special service from an inter-library network. About a fifth of our high-school students are considered to be academically talented in the sense that they will probably go on to get college degrees. Many of these academically talented students are already receiving college-level education in their high schools, and it is going to be a problem for the high-school librarian to be able to adapt himself to the needs of the gifted students. We must make every effort to meet the needs of the unusual person who is hungry for learning and whose needs can be met only by us or by some substitute system of information agencies.

At the opposite extreme is the functionally illiterate group, the undereducated group for whom basic and fundamental education has been proposed and on which the national educational associations and the federal government have been placing unusual emphasis in recent years. I am not entirely certain that this emphasis is totally justified. It is certainly one of the areas which we must explore in connection with the local types of library service that we are talking about. Again a reference to Japan, which was very proud of its degree of literacy and very much concerned about its low adult use of public libraries. They said,

"How can we be a country of such high literacy and have so few adults use the Japanese libraries?" At that time I discovered that compulsory education in Japan extended through the sixth grade. It had been my experience before that time, and tested since, that the average number of potential public library users is approximately equal to the number of high-school graduates in the community, in the state, region, or nation. That does not mean, of course, that all high-school graduates will use public libraries and that no people without high-school degrees will use libraries, but it still represents the approximate potential use group. This is a large and expanding group which we must be prepared to serve, it is the central group of our potential service.

What about this group that falls outside of that field? If Mr. Neff is right and educators are inclined to think of people who have only completed eighth grade as being functionally literate, what are our chances of providing them with services? Of course, we can use non-book materials, we can use audio-visual materials and we can attempt to provide educational extension services to this group and to arouse their interest in a knowledge of recorded ideas of mankind. But I suspect that the amount of effort involved may not always be entirely successful and that it may not be the library's true role to provide the basic and fundamental education which is necessary here.

I hesitate to quote this next opinion on this point because it always sounds a little snobbish, but it is intended to be a sociologically exact statement. Berelson in his book, *The Library's Public* says, "Public libraries will always be used by self-selected cultural minorities."[5] Now you have to analyze that phrase very carefully because there is nothing undemocratic about it. An individual decides whether he is going to use our libraries or not. The number of individuals who do decide to use our libraries is presently certainly a minority and may continue to be a minority. However, while only about forty per cent of the American people now have a high-school education, this percentage is rising rapidly and by 1980 the average adult twenty-five years or older will have a high-school education, so that we face the prospect within the next generation or two of the public libraries, at least, being used by a self-selected cultural majority rather than minority. We must prepare for this majority use as well as for the use by the under-edu-

[5]Bernard Berelson, *The Library's Public* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949, p. 130.)

cated and culturally handicapped; as well as by the gifted people who need special materials and special help. The number of professional, technical, and similar workers is similarly increasing as the educational level increases. Within the past decade the number of such workers on a national basis increased by two-thirds, and college and university enrollments are increasing at such a rapid rate that by 1980 there will be three times more people in college than there were in 1960. Thus the potential audience for library use is expanding tremendously. We must gear ourselves to meet these needs and to find the funds, and to develop the skills and techniques with which to serve these people better.

As far as the field of technology is concerned, which will be one of the elements of this development, we must learn to use the tools of the computer age, and the revolutionary communications, photocopying, and even printing and typesetting devices. We must learn to use them because if we do not somebody else is going to make them available. If you have ever seen the graphic retrieval potentials of computers, you will know that we are going to have to adopt these devices in order to meet the needs of many of our users. On the other hand, in addition to the formal use by the educated who are increasingly becoming the majority group, we have to recognize that there are age levels and individual differences in our users. We must not only have more librarians and better librarians, and more highly specialized and versatile librarians; but we must also have more librarians concerned with the different needs of various age groups, the young user and children using school and public libraries.

I do not intend at this point to get into an argument as to the future relative role of school and public libraries. Obviously, they are to a considerable extent in the same business, but they are not even open yet the same hours. And none of them is open eighteen or twenty-four hours a day as they ought to be. As long as we are so far behind in both school and public library work, I think there is a need for both and they had better continue to be in competition. We, obviously, have to be concerned over how to provide better service to the pre-school and elementary school age children and to the high-school student who is sometimes called the teenager, sometimes called the young adult, and sometimes less complimentary terms, but whom I like to think of as the beginning adult who obviously requires special attention by librarians to introduce him to

the world of adult libraries. After being a beginning adult, of course, he becomes a busy adult because the working adult is especially busy since he is the least rapidly growing sector of our population and carries the principal burden of paying the taxes for the expanding social services for the very rapidly growing group of children, of beginning adults, and of our older citizens whom we might call the bored adults. The poor busy adult has to pay taxes for extremely rapidly growing groups of the population who are placing heavier demands on our libraries.

A few words on the kinds of librarians that this type of library future may require, and then a few words on education for librarianship itself.

The status of librarians in the educational systems of the future is not clear. We may submerge in a system of formal education or information systems in which the librarian will play a subordinate role. Or, if we prepare ourselves properly, it may be possible for us to be in charge, to direct, and make generally effective this educational force. I would like again to quote Dr. Louis Round Wilson, who in a paper a number of years ago defined librarianship as "the art of directing the great sources of power in books for the use and convenience of man." Think how far we fall short of the ability to direct the great sources of power in books for the use and convenience of man and how hard we must work to prepare librarians for this task. I would like to quote a more recent writer on librarianship in this connection and that is Doris Stokes, the editor of *Top of the News*. In the recent issue of *Top of the News* she poses a challenge to us as to the kinds of librarians and the role that librarians must play, and it seems to me to pose the double problem of the librarian of the future very effectively. Miss Stokes says,

> The challenge is to us as librarians to conquer a cultivated reluctance to understand and accept the tools of technology and it is to us as creative individuals to foster in others that creative impulse which distinguishes man from the fin.[6]

Thus we need librarians who can master technology and utilize it as a tool in providing personalized service in assisting users of libraries in their own self-education process.

---

[6]Doris Stokes, *Top of the News*, XXIII (April, 1967) 230.

It seems to me, therefore, that the kinds of education that will be required for these librarians is going to be markedly different and is going to have to be greater in quantity, and certainly greater in quality, than at present. Library education in the South, along with library education elsewhere, is faced with the necessity of training at least two types of librarians, the skilled generalist and the skilled specialist. Both will have to be multi-faceted, will require more diverse education than ever before, must master more skills, and must be more firmly grounded in educational and social philosophy if they wish to assume their proper role of leadership. The school librarian is going to have to have formal education in educational methods, including the development of electronic data processing methods of education, formal education in audio-visual media, and formal education in child psychology and learning. The college librarian is going to have to have similar multiple education such as education in librarianship, in the organization and control of knowledge, however; also education in the methods of education, in audio-visual, and in data processing techniques. And, astonishingly, the public librarian is going to need to have the same range of skills, including also an ability in the field of public administration, meaning the ability to get more tax money for the support of our valuable activities. And certainly, the research librarian, in addition to his intimate knowledge of librarianship and library research, is going to need to have a mastery of electronic data processing and is going to have available to him a range of subject skills which is beyond our present experience in terms of analyzing publications, in terms of quoting publications for a much greater degree of analytic in-put than we have ever attempted before in assisting the specialized user. All of these demands upon our future librarians have been recognized already, and I am sure that Dr. Lester Asheim will be referring to this.

To prove that I am not being totally impractical in proposing such a broad scope for the training of future librarians, I would like to quote very briefly from the report of the Commission on the National Plan on Library Education published in the current issue of the *ALA Bulletin*. This Commission proposes that:

> Attention be given to present and probable future personnel requirements of school, college, university, public and special libraries of education and research agencies han-

> dling audio and visual media and of agencies engaged in providing specialized technical and scientific information regardless of the means through which such information is acquired, organized, and disseminated or the degree of analysis to which it is subjected.[7]

I suggest that in addition to improving the level of our first or professional degree and working toward the provision of more facilities for offering the doctor's degree, that the library profession might well explore more fully the necessity of more than one master's degree, a master's degree in librarianship as well as a master's degree in a subject field, in education, or in audio-visual media. If we do not have this multiple education, we are not going to be in charge of the forces which exist. We are going to become specialists subordinated to others who are paid to direct these interrelated activities.

One or two final words. I said at the beginning that I reserve the right to criticize. When I came to facing up to that challenge and determining what criticisms it was fair to present, I found that these were certainly not criticisms of Southern libraries and Southern librarians and that they are not even criticisms of the South, certainly not of the South alone. They are criticisms of our national failure to move ahead as rapidly as circumstances permit. So I do wish to be critical but not just of you and my criticisms should be applied to all of us.

We have been too slow to pool the resources of our libraries, to cut across political and organizational lines. The poverty or the scarcity of resources which all of us suffer from have been used as an excuse for not sharing, whereas they represent the greatest reasons for sharing. We have been too slow on state and interstate cooperation and on achieving the massive levels of state and federal support that are necessary in order to enable us to meet the needs of our library users. We have been too slow on technological development. Everything in the data processing field takes twice as long as you think it is going to take. It is therefore very important that we start right now. We have been too slow on the development of multi-specialist training for librarians. We have been too slow in recruiting, developing, and adequately compensating our librarians.

---

[7] "A Report from the Commission on a National Plan for Library Education," *ALA Bulletin* LXI (April, 1967), 420.

And we have been too slow in asserting educational and social leadership in our fields.

In conclusion, I would like to refer again to a distinguished gentleman and scholar, that preeminent Southern librarian, Louis Round Wilson. I do not in any sense mean to be identifying myself with Dean Wilson, but I cannot cite his name and the terms gentleman and scholar without telling one of my favorite stories about him and about the South. In a seminar in university library administration, he told with his inimitable twinkle, of a university which had sought from him suggestions for a person to be named director of the library who should be a gentleman and a scholar and if he could not be both, could at least be rated a gentleman. To my embarrassment some months later, I came in to the Dean and said that I had just been offered the directorship of the University of Alabama Library. After describing, forty years ago, the library needs of the South and the effort and instruments needed to meet these needs, Dr. Wilson said to me that he did not advocate the expenditure of energy and the time and the funds for library purposes simply that the Southeast might stand, statistically, on a more equal footing with representatives of other sections. It is rather that we may perfect an institution which has demonstrated its value as an instrument in the development of an intelligent and highly complex civilization. It is that the institution to which we have dedicated our lives may assist this new advancing South in the discovery and use of those things which will multiply the more enduring satisfactions of its expanding life.

Problem Areas in Library Education

Jack Dalton, Dean
School of Library Service
Columbia University

This afternoon I am thinking of more than one Southeastern conference I have attended. I suppose I am most conscious of the one Dr. Jones referred to this morning, the one held in Atlanta nineteen years ago, when the Southeastern Library Association called a group together to talk about education for librarianship. It is true, as she said, that the same old problems we are still talking about were all set forth at that conference. We talked about articulation, the core curriculum, shortages, recruiting, specialization — when it should begin and its place in the curriculum — the relation of general to professional education, the danger of emphasizing routines, and, of course, money. We did one very important thing at that meeting, something you rarely hear of at a conference. At the first general session we named a sub-committee to bring in a list of definitions; we asked the sub-committee to define librarian, and core curriculum, and a few other terms we expected to be using that week.

You do not have such a sub-committee, but I warn you at the outset, if we are going to get anywhere in the next two or three days, we are going to have to be awfully clear about the way we use words because this conference has been set up to deal with training and education *at all levels* and *in all areas* and *in all types* of institutions. I do hope that as we break up into sections we will keep this in mind. Even with a list of definitions before us on that earlier occasion, we had a lot of trouble.

Two years ago we held here the conference referred to this morning as the *first* in this series. Since this *is* one of a series, I think it is important to remind you of the conclusions reached by that first conference. Designed as a background conference, the participants "concluded that libraries must be made to support:

1. The growing economy, as it shifts from an agricultural to an industrial base, and as untrained or undertrained workers become an increasing liability.
2. The research needs of business and industry, especially the technology-oriented industry for which the South is competing with all other regions.

3. The sharply increased needs of responsible citizenship, as the new voter must be equipped for a leadership role in the future of his own community.
4. Efforts to prepare *all* the people of the South, Negro and white, to live in an integrated society by helping to dispel, through knowledge and understanding, the needless fears of ignorance.
5. The development of reading skills for children and adults through school and public libraries, adequately stocked and constantly accessible to all.
6. The development of indigenous regional leadership in the professions through the support of higher education by strong college and university libraries.
7. The continuing education of adults to enable them to move with ease and confidence through a rapidly changing society to the realization of their highest potential.
8. Community action programs and other aspects of the Economic Opportunity programs, with the public library taking its full share of responsibility of initiating and supporting community development.
9. Elementary and secondary education, especially since the elementary school libraries constitute the first, and often the *only*, exposure to books and other tools of learning that many children will have, they are a major priority for development.
10. The development of cultural awareness, of listening and verbal skills, of taste, and appreciation for all citizens from the pre-school to the adult level. It is especially important that public libraries provide, and help other agencies to undertake, pre-school programs that will send all children to the first grades of school with zest and a more equalized readiess to learn." [1]

Those are very large objectives, but they are the reasons for our being here again today. I do not have to remind a Southeastern group of the very considerable conference activity in this region during the past 25 years. One might reasonably ask, "Why another?" Earlier this week Dorothy Ryan and I were having dinner

[1]As reported in an Atlanta University news release dated April 30, 1965.

with a library school dean who, when he learned that we were coming here to talk about library education in the South, expostulated, "Library education in the South! What makes that different from education anywhere else? Library education is library education." We did not try to explain the matter to *him*, but I do ask *you*, "Is it"? I am going to return in a little bit to my conviction that *time* and *place* mean a great deal in library education.

The temptation to generalize this afternoon, to talk about problems affecting all professions is very great, just as the temptation to talk about some of our own professions of faith is strong upon me. There has been much questioning of some of these professions lately and I hope you will have time to consider some of these questions. For example, there is the one that goes all the way back to Williamson who said that

> No amount of training in library technique can make a successful librarian of a person who lacks a good general education. The most essential part of training for librarianship is the general education that is ordinarily secured nowadays through a college course . . . The time required for the specific training for librarianship is comparatively short — usually but one year — because the most important part of the equipment is general education and a knowledge of men and books which can be acquired in a variety of ways but which is most likely to be found in those who have completed a college course.[2]

I have never questioned that, and many of you have not, but we sometimes act as if we believed the most important part of the librarian's training was that little technical component, and there is more than a little evidence that many among us think it does not much matter whether this is inserted in the curriculum.

I recently had an exchange with a fellow library school dean, and a very thoughtful dean, who wrote to say that he was concerned about the ALA *Standards*. He was particularly concerned about the standard dealing with the curriculum, the five-year curriculum, that is. He said his experience in libraries and in his library school had convinced him that the program described by the *Standards*

[2]Charles C. Williamson, Training for Library Service (New York, The Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1923), p. 6.

is the worst possible background for a librarian. He said he believed that in most library situations one needs to be either an out-and-out generalist, for whom a liberal arts major is largely a waste of time or a specialist for whom the broad background is largely wasted. Following an exchange of letters and views in which I argued for a strong liberal arts base, he concluded by saying that he agreed personally with the sentiments I had expressed, but he did not think it the place of the library school to help a profession make a decision as to what constitutes the best preparation by telling it that we would not help in the preparation of its librarians unless they had a certain type of undergraduate education. If he is right, then we have been wrong. In any event, it is important that we consider the point because the question he has raised is being raised insistently today on all sides, and not just by librarians. The Dean of Engineering at Columbia said recently:

> One widely supported opinion in the engineering profession and among educators is that engineering should be, like law and medicine, a postgraduate study for which a diverse educational experience in a liberal arts college would be required preparation. Many members of our Faculty hold the contrary view. To them engineering education — should begin as early as possible. It should begin not later than high school and preferably in primary school.[3]

I raise these questions with you for your sectional deliberations and I am obviously asking that you question the basic assumptions of the ALA *Standards*. I happen to be one of those who feel that the ALA *Standards* have held up remarkably well. I do not know of any standards that have worked so well for so many people in a period of such great change over so long a time. But they are being questioned, as they should be, and the more critically you examine them, the more helpful you will be to those who must in the near future revise them once again.

But enough of the generalities I promised *not* to talk about. I want to talk briefly about three problem areas which I think are common to all of us; I want to talk about two problems which I think have a peculiar relevance for Southern librarians and South-

[3]John R. Dunning, "The Identity of Engineering," *Columbia Engineering* Quarterly, XVII (November, 1963), 14.

ern library schools; and I want to spend a few minutes on a topic of such immediate importance to this conference, a topic of such urgency, that I wish every region in the country were holding this week a conference such as this. You are to be congratulated that you are and that you have mechanisms to do something about the matter I want to discuss later.

First of all, some general problems. I want to raise some questions about manpower, the impact of technology on librarianship, and this discipline we call librarianship. Fortunately, the manpower problem is at long last getting national attention. You know that ALA will consider it this summer with attendant publications and publicity. You know that the Council on Library Resources recently made a grant to enable the National Book Committee and ALA to hold a conference on manpower. A research project is underway at Maryland. We finally seem to realize that we are dealing with a very difficult, a very subtle problem which calls for the kind of sophisticated analysis that has been sadly lacking in our loud cries for *more people*. What we need most is a better statement of our problems and our specific needs.

Some of you will recall an article in the spring 1964 issue of the *Southeastern Librarian* in which Sarah Jones, Virginia McJenkin, and others discussed working with the regional accrediting association to improve library standards. It would be instructive to take a group like the school librarians and to study some of their problems as they relate to the manpower shortage. I am sure we would find confusion among the states as to what they need, even what they mean when they say *a librarian*. You know and I know that we would find antiquated certification requirements; you and I know that there is confusion among the educators and a lack of agreement on standards; you and I know that there has been something less than complete understanding and accord, not to say a certain bitterness in the area between the librarians and the audio-visual people which when resolved might tend to reduce the manpower shortage. The questions remain. Do we need more people (librarians?) at the lowest level? Where is that level? Or do we need a much better qualified group at a higher level? You are all too close to the problems of technology and libraries to require extended comment from me.

The question that should concern us here is the librarian's role in this area. It is not an easy question to put properly. Carl Overhage's

recent observations are suggestive. In his article, "Science Libraries: Prospects and Problems," he appeals "to first-rate minds to divert to the problems of our university libraries some of the effort that now goes into research and teaching." This, as you know, was Weinberg's big plea. Overhage says,

> Mechanization itself, however well conceived and executed, is not enough. The introduction of the new machinery must be accompanied by intellectual efforts directed toward improving the organization and the quality of the recorded substance in each field of learning.[4]

In dealing with this aspect of the library problem he calls upon scholars and administrators to face the challenges that are beyond the reach of librarians and information transfer engineers. He goes on to say why he thinks so and concludes that

> It is neither fair nor sensible to assign to libraries the total responsibility for scholarly communication. Quality judgments concerning the substance of the printed record are essential elements of the total task.[5]

It is when we begin to talk about quality judgments that I begin to be most concerned. And this brings me to my third consideration, *the discipline*. What should be the central discipline of a school of librarianship? It has been said that literary criticism is or ought to be the central discipline of a school of English. At the New Orleans ALA meeting recently, Cyril Houle observed that

> Every profession is a field of application based on deeper arts and sciences. Teaching depends upon psychology and sociology, the health professions depend upon anatomy, physiology, and biochemistry, and engineering depends upon mathematics and physics.

He added

> If the professional simply studies new developments in the field of application, he is turned into a technician, performing operations whose basic meaning he does not understand. To retain his breadth of vision, he must re-

---

[4]Carl F. J. Overhage, "Science Libraries: Prospects and Problems," Science, CLV (February 17, 1967), 802.
[5]*Ibid.*, p. 805.

30

> main aware of what is developing in the basic arts and sciences which support his practice.[6]

I would like to hear this conference discuss the areas of basic arts and sciences which support librarianship. This is surely more important in the spring of 1967 than rearranging a curriculum or articulation.

This relation of theory to practice has long been a primary concern of every profession. Dean Brooks of the Harvard School of Engineering and Applied Sciences in one of his recent annual reports addressed himself to the "relationship between science and technology in education" in these terms:

> The original concept of an engineering school, as of a medical school, was an association of practitioners who used the benefit of their varied experience to teach young people. This tradition is somewhat maintained to this day in the field of architecture, but in both medicine and engineering the importance of the underlying sciences has become so great that medical and engineering faculties are increasingly populated with basic scientists who do research or teaching in sciences which are relevant to but by no means identical with the practice of medicine or engineering. The old form of teaching primarily by practicing physicians or engineers was found wanting, because practical knowledge was too rapidly being made obsolete by new scientific developments which could not be fully absorbed or appreciated by the mature practitioner. Yet in the process something of the spirit and attitude of the skilled practitioner was lost, particularly his willingness to deal with problems whole rather than in terms of the individual contributing disciplines. Working with genuine realistic medical or engineering problems requires vast resources, beyond the scale of ordinary university departments. In medicine this problem has been partially met by the teaching hospitals, but in engineering the analog of the teaching hospitals, but in engineering the analog of laboratory in industry. How, then, is the spirit of applied science and engineering to be retained in engineering education? The intellectual foundations of engineering lie

[6]Cyril O. Houle, "The Role of Continuing Education in Current Professional Development," *ALA Bulletin* LXI (March, 1967), 263-264.

> increasingly in the basic sciences; inevitably engineering faculties will contain large numbers of people whose way of thinking is more akin to that of the scientist than the engineer. It is these people that will develop many of the techniques which will be used by the engineer of the future. And it is their knowledge, not that of the current engineer, which the student will be using ten years from now. The reconciliation of these two necessary attitudes of mind in the process of engineering education is the central dilemma of the field today.[7]

What is the analog of the teaching hospital for the library school? We know what it is, but we have been *significantly* backward in developing the kind of relationships between the library school and the university library within which it is usually located, or between the library school and the public library systems and school systems which usually surround it. I hope this conference will concern itself with these relationships. Incidentally, it is sometimes suggested that we should leave the substantive areas I have in mind to others and that we should concern ourselves with the *flow* of information. I am not yet prepared to believe that you can understand the flow unless you know a good deal about what is flowing. We all know that the differences between physics and economics and English literature are considerable even for the person who is concerned only with the flow.

I said at the outset that I think *time* and *place* are of enormous importance in any discussion of education for librarianship. Anyone who has worked in more than one country in the past few years knows that one man's triumphs might be another man's failures. The differences between library schools in this country, what they are trying to do, and what it is appropriate for them to do, are vast. You could not persuade me that the job of the Graduate Library School at Chicago does not differ markedly from that of the School of Library Service here at Atlanta University. I believe there *should* be a difference between the programs of the library schools of the George Peabody College for Teachers and the University of California.

There is a difference between what New York State is doing in the programs John Cory described this morning and what can be

---

[7]Harney Brooks, "The Dean's Report, 1963-64," *Bulletin of The Society of Harvard Engineers and Scientists* (December, 1964), 6.

done in some sections of the South for a long time to come, and these differences must be reflected in library school curricula. Certainly there are some common basic concerns and certainly all librarians have some things in common. But the most casual comparison of library school curricula will show that this is a very small area indeed and it will also show that many schools have quite properly recognized and responded to the needs of the regions they serve.

A brief word about "equal opportunity." Most of you know that about five years ago the Rockefeller Foundation drew up a statement setting forth its goals for the period ahead. These goals were concerned with an adequate food supply for the world, efforts toward population stability, the training of promising individuals in the development of institutions in areas where lack of leadership retards progress, the advancement of equality of opportunity for all, and the promotion of man's cultural development. The brief statement on equal opportunity from that document reads:

> Rockefeller Foundation objectives have been pursued in the interests of mankind, without consideration to race, creed, or color. The Foundation and related boards, such as the General Education Board and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, long ago recognized the need for better educational opportunities for all. Their program sought broadly to advance toward this goal. Over the years these three boards spent more than $65 million in the United States alone to extend educational opportunities for Negroes. Large additional sums have been invested in general education.
>
> Today our country is in a new phase of adjustment between Negro and white citizens in our population. We believe that private philanthropy has a continuing responsibility to aid this process. In our judgment, the best contribution this Foundation can make is to carry forward efforts to give increasing numbers of our disadvantaged citizens better educational opportunities to enable them to develop their full potential and to take their rightful place in society.[8]

[8]*Plans for the Future,* A Statement of the Trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation, September 20, 1963, p. 7.

That is why this conference is being held. One could find many parallels in recent documents; it is hardly necessary to labor the point here. But we have given too little serious thought to the ways in which library schools can relate their activities, if they want to relate their activities, to the opportunities the foundations and the government are anxious to support. This is a topic which Louis Round Wilson, who was quoted several times this morning, was talking about as early as the 1926 Signal Mountain Conference of the Southeastern Library Association. You and I know perfectly well that while we can produce statistics which show great change over the past few years, these changes are relative changes and the problem still remains an acute problem. What are the implications for the library schools in 1967?

There are new and special problems that call for individual and institutional soul searching, and I assume that is what we are here for. Years ago Louis Round Wilson was urging that some school in the South set up a doctoral program because he knew perfectly well that the sociological problems, the economic problems, the political problems, and the library problems involved are not going to be solved by research conducted outside the South. Until these problems are attacked here, where they have an immediacy that they do not have elsewhere, they are not going to be attacked.

I realize how very much I have left untouched. I have not talked about articulation. I would not dare, with the expert on that subject sitting in the front row; Mrs. Florrinell Morton, who can speak to that topic as few people can, will be glad to talk with you about that. I think it is a critical problem, but I am certain it is a problem that can be solved readily if we could reach agreement as to what a librarian *is* and *does,* as to the levels at which they are going to do their work, and as to what is going to be needed at each level. It seems to me that the important thing to remember when articulation is considered, at whatever point programs are set up, is that there exist the kind of frankness and complete understanding — is honesty too strong a word? — which I miss all too frequently in the relations between school and student. After seven years of sitting in a dean's chair in a school which does not accept any undergraduate work in library science, the cases that have disturbed me most have been those of students who went blithely through a four-year program never knowing from any suggestion, from any source, that this was not what everybody did and who,

having discovered after a while that they simply were not eligible for certain jobs, found that they had so cluttered up their curriculum below that they were going to lose a lot of time repairing the damage done. I do not believe this is necessary in the overwhelming majority of cases. Where it is still necessary, it is our job to point out to the states what is wrong with the requirements. I have noticed that wherever you find an undergraduate program with a large component of library science you are likely to find an equally large component of something else, frequently more than one additional large component, and the combination just does not add up to a satisfactory solution to anybody's problem.

And I have neglected continuing education. I will pause here only long enough to say that I believe the responsibility for continuing education should be shared by the library schools, the alumni of the library schools, the library associations, and all the appropriate state agencies working together. This is a vitally important area for this conference.

Then, of course, there is preparation for the full range of services from the village library, about which John Cory spoke, to the highly specialized libraries, and there are many programs from the technicians' level to the doctoral level. They are all important, but I must leave them to you while I turn quickly to that topic of immediate importance to which I referred earlier, a topic of such importance to this conference that I have cut short some things I might have said in order to get to it. I am speaking of the availability of government funds at the moment and the implications of the availability of these funds for program development in librarianship.

Consider for a moment the number of scholarships and fellowships available this year and the funds we expect to have available next year and the following year. Under the same Rockefeller Foundation grant that has been referred to a time or two today, Atlanta University offers currently a dozen scholarships at $1750 and three or four at $3500. When this program was set up three years ago, this was the handsomest batch of scholarships and fellowships available to librarians anywhere. But today under Title II-B of the Higher Education Act of 1965, there are available hundreds of scholarships carrying stipends of twenty-two to twenty-five hundred dollars, depending upon the academic level, plus full tuition, plus dependency allowances, plus travel. And this is just for the regular

session; there are additional allowances for summer sessions. Now if this were just a one-shot operation, it would still be remarkable, considering what it could do to the configuration of the map of librarianship for the next year or so; however, this appears to be just the beginning. In 1968-69 there will probably be available for program development under Title II-B at least twice the sum available this year. This money will be available for all types of program development, for the institutes which the school librarians lost in another area last year, for institutes devoted to academic libraries, public libraries, all kinds of libraries, and for fellowship and scholarship programs. This sudden prosperity raises many questions.

I was at a Washington meeting recently with a group discussing the kinds of proposals one might reasonably expect when one of the deans in the group asked if it would be fair to require state plans of people submitting proposals. And the fast answer that came back from the representative of the Office of Education present was, "I would prefer regional plans." I suppose if I could leave only one heavily underlined sentence with you this afternoon, that sentence would be, *I would prefer regional plans*. I need not press the matter. You are fortunate in having the long and valuable experience of the Southeastern Library Association as a background for your discussions; you are fortunate in having in the Southeastern Library Association a mechanism through which you can work rapidly and efficiently should you choose to do so; and you are fortunate in having some months lead time to plan a program for next year.

I think you will want to talk about priorities, state and regional priorities. If you do not get together on these, if you do not have a regional plan, I can see Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and all the rest coming up with similar plans, and they will surely suffer from a lack of cooperative and coordinated activity. You have a golden opportunity to consider the relation of the state agencies to the institutions of higher education and how they ought to be working together; I hope you will not let it slip.

This brings me to a question suggested by Archie McNeal at last year's conference and by others at various times. Is this the time when once again a Southern field representative is needed? He could be an extraordinarily useful person in your work with and among the various groups in the several states. As a catalytic agent and as a representative of some such group as the Southeastern Library Association — perhaps you would prefer another — he could

be of great assistance in ways that will be obvious to this audience.

I have been talking, of course, about one little area, fellowships and institutes available under the Higher Education Act. You know about funds available under LSCA and in other areas. To enjoy the greatest benefits from the funds now available to you, the institutions of higher learning and the state agencies must work very closely with the library schools and there must be the kind of blending of activities John Cory spoke of this morning in talking about *Metro* and the other joint enterprises he described for you.

In other words, I am talking here about program development in its broadest possible extension, from pre-professional to continuing education for the post-doctoral people, and from pre-school activity to adult education. I am talking about institutes and workshops, and I am talking about total cooperation among all the groups that are concerned with education. In short, the total plan.

You have the mechanisms, you have had the experience, and this conference must not pass up this opportunity. This group is in a position to propose a coordinated plan, to point the way to cooperative effort, and to define regional aims. If this morning John Cory seemed to be painting for you a promised land, I am prepared this afternoon to say to you that it was no mirage. And my advice to you is go up and possess it.

The Role of the ALA Office for Library Education

Lester Asheim, Director
Office of Library Education
American Library Association

It was the original intent of the planners of this conference that my part in the program would be philosophical and inspirational on the topic of education for librarianship. It soon became clear, however, that the team of Cory and Dalton would be a pretty hard act to follow, and that there was little that I'd be likely to say as well, and with as much authority. In scrambling around then for something that it might be presumed I would know something about, or might know a little more about than other program participants, we came up with about the only thing that we could safely suggest: The Office for Library Education. Since it is a brand new operation, nothing is yet published on its activities from which anyone else could have derived much information. As the first and only director of the office, I have that much advantage. But I am afraid, even so, that much of the time I will sound like Little Sir Echo.

The work of the Office for Library Education is not, of course, specifically concerned with the special problems of the South, but the special problems of the South in this field are, it is to be hoped and as John Cory has suggested, becoming less and less special. Problems of library education are nation-wide and sufficiently urgent to have led to the establishment of a special office within the ALA to be concerned with them. Although Jack Dalton underlined the importance of time and place in matters of library education, it seems to me that what he was saying was not that there are not basic questions, but rather that there are many different answers.

First, let me explain briefly what are the role and the nature of the Office for Library Education. The Office was made possible by a matching grant from the H. W. Wilson Foundation, in the amount of $75,000 over a period of six years. The grant, announced in 1965, was made for the purpose of supporting "an enlarged ALA program in library education and related fields." The Office began its operations — or, more precisely, opened for business — in September, 1966, with my appointment as Director. I back away from the term "began its operations" because, for several months we did not really operate as effectively as we should. Through January and February we were completely without secretarial help, which meant that the work of the Office could not be accomplished because we

were too busy with the work in the office. Then, all at once, everything began to take shape; I not only have a full secretarial staff, but the promise of an Executive Secretary for the Library Education Division who will also be an Assistant Director of the Office for Library Education. Dr. Agnes Reagan, whom all of you know, will come to the Library Education Division in June — and — suddenly next summer — all's right with the world. I realize that this solution of my problems complicates yours, but I think that will be only temporary. I have no doubt that Dr. Reagan's activities in the LED will, in the not-too-distant long run, benefit library education in the South in many tangible ways.

"Library education and related fields" say the terms of the grant — and the scope of attention covered by such a statement seems to be boundless. As one looks at librarianship and all of its varied activities and responsibilities, it appears that there is nothing in the field that isn't in some way related to library education — and not so remotely either. One thinks immediately, for example, of recruitment — which takes place before the student enters a program of formal library education; and of manpower utilization — which takes place after the student leaves the library school. Neither activity is directly the responsibility of the schools — both are of infinite importance to anyone concerned about library education.

Thus, in one way or another, the Office for Library Education will have to be in touch with what is going on in recruitment for librarianship, selection of applicants for admission to the field, formal education in the library schools, (with all of its attendant problems of articulation of undergraduate and graduate programs); continuing education, and utilization. Such a range and scope begins to cut across several divisional lines within the ALA, but I am hopeful that we are not going to enter into jurisdictional disputes about who does what. My office is meant to be a coordinating one, making sure that there is communication among the several units which deal with any aspects of any of these problems but not ambitious to take over tasks already adequately handled by existing units. Walking that tightrope may be one of the most difficult assignments for my office, but it is a tight rope made primarily of red tape — and somehow one can cope with red tape, if he must.

Thus responsibility for many of these areas will continue to remain where it is now. Recruitment, for example, is the province of

the Library Administration Division and continues to operate there, with an active hot line between my office and it in daily use. Manpower utilization is even more logically a responsibility of administrators than of formal educators, and again the LAD and the OLE cooperate on matters of our mutual concern. Accreditation remains the responsibility of the Committee on Accreditation, a standing committee of the association independent of any of the divisions or offices — although now more closely tied to my office than to any other. (Perhaps this is as good a place as any to clear up a popular misconception: the COA is not a committee of the LED. An accident of history and expediency made it seem logical, for a while, for the Executive Secretary of the LED to act also as Secretary for the COA — but these are really two different hats. To try to symbolize this overtly, I have taken COA liaison into my office and out of LED. With the increasing activities of all units concerned with educational matters, it is quite clear that no part-time attention to COA is going to be enough in any case, and some other means for supplying COA's secretariat services will have to be found. But LED will remain the unit through which the membership of the Association can participate actively in the field of library education and related areas. With some of the peripheral activities removed from the Secretary's office, it is hoped that LED can become under Dr. Reagan's leadership the kind of forum for educators and practitioners that it was meant to be — and that is so urgently needed at the present time.)

If all of those responsibilities are handled elsewhere, what then — I hear the dues-paying membership saying — is left for the Office for Library Education? Well, as Jack and John and this afternoon's discussion made pretty clear: there are a few problems in the field that require attention. The real challenge will not be trying to think up something to do — but trying to decide where to start.

The shortage of manpower is an over-arching problem that affects many aspects of library education. Because trained personnel are in such short supply, the schools are under constant pressure to get more people out faster, and to be less strict in their requirements for admission. But since, at the same time, the field also wants more content covered and higher quality of personnel, the schools are at a real impasse. Begging the pardon of those of you in the audience who are library administrators and workers in the field, it begins to look to me as though the schools ought to ignore

your pressures, and try to determine instead what needs to be taught and what kind of qualifications a student needs before he can benefit from the teaching. This could mean, as you can guess, higher standards of admission and longer programs of schooling. On the other hand, it could mean something quite different — and it is this that is more likely to be the emerging picture. It could mean that there is a great deal of content currently in library school programs that could be taught at the undergraduate level, and that people could begin to work effectively in libraries upon graduation from a four-year college program, with a fifth and sixth year of graduate-level education reserved for increasingly specialized content as the individual moves up to deeper and heavier responsibilities. Let me make very clear my conviction that the kind of undergraduate training I have in mind is not meant to replace graduate education in our field. It is my conviction that it would not weaken our master's programs, but strengthen and upgrade them. At this moment I am not prepared to say how much of a four-year program should be library education, or that such a program could lead to a professional degree. Let me say only that there is some work done in libraries that does not require a fifth year master's degree for its effective accomplishment.

If such a possibility is even tentatively explored, a first requisite is a definition of levels of responsibility in library work, at both the professional and less-than-professional levels. In my mind, the first step for both educators and practitioners is a hard, cold, objective and analytical look at what goes on in libraries, with the purpose of re-defining and rearranging our current job descriptions. As you know, there are many who feel that the so-called shortage of professional librarians would disappear if professional people were reassigned to jobs that were completely professional, instead of the jobs that most of us typically perform—three-fourths low-level routine and one-fourth truly professional. If it were possible to determine how much background, training, and education is needed to perform each necessary function in the library—and if we could then re-write job descriptions so that those tasks which require only a high-school education and a year of technical skills' training were put together in a job for such a high-school graduate, we could then begin to devise programs of training at the undergraduate level which would prepare people for those jobs. This would mean completely ignoring the present titles and the present clusters

of duties, and if we were capable of divorcing ourselves from current preconceptions about content, it should also mean that the higher level of positions would require upgraded professional preparation which would alter the graduate programs now in effect.

Meanwhile if we don't do something about this ourselves others are going to do it for us. Already, junior and community colleges — not completely oblivious to the funds available under the Vocational Education Act — are beginning to introduce technical training courses for librarians, and not all of them are based on an analysis of the real needs of libraries. As a result, a level of positions has been introduced which we, as librarians, may or may not find useful in our libraries, but which many librarians feel we must adopt — because it is there.

I must admit that the "technician" solution is theoretically logical, but I must confess at the same time to some qualms about how it will work out in reality. Unless there is some control over those programs — and over the ways in which the graduates of such programs are used — they might well provide the field, not with the technical assistants they are supposed to turn out, but with people who will find administrative positions without supervision in small libraries of various kinds — school, public and special. Such low-level training, based on a minimum amount of the general education we claim to believe is essential, must eventually lead to the deterioration of the service that best represents our profession.

Our field, unfortunately, has been characterized for a long time by the philosophy that a little is better than none: that some training, however inadequate, is better than no training. And that is the justification frequently voiced to me when I suggest my reservations about the technician panacea. What this reveals is that we do not yet have a good basic definition of what librarianship is, or — better — should be; that we have no completely sound description of what tasks need to be performed to realize the objectives of librarianship; and that we do not possess satisfactory standards for governing either the performance or the education required for it.

Standards for evaluating performance, and standards for evaluating library education, do exist and have been the responsibility of the ALA through its membership units. One immediate task for the Office for Library Education and the Committee on Accreditation,

then, is the review and perhaps revision of standards for accreditation — taking into account the changes in our own field and in the society since the existing standards were written. The present standards are concerned only with graduate education, and preparation for positions in libraries which we call "professional" — without knowing quite what the term implies.

To all intents and purposes, a "professional" librarian tends to be understood in daily practice to be anyone who has spent a year in an accredited library school. With no more required of a professional than that, it follows that if we want more professional people we merely have to stamp "Accredited" on a lot more schools. If we were to accredit undergraduate programs, think how many more "professionals" there could be.

This is a slight exaggeration of the kinds of proposals that have been coming to my office, but not as much as you might think. At the same time that many leaders in librarianship are complaining that our standards are not high enough, a great many others are demanding that accreditation be extended to cover a variety of programs which are not up even to the current standard. Perhaps I may be forgiven for concluding that the label is often seen as more important than the content.

This state of affairs dramatizes the perennial problem of accreditation, not only in our field but in any professional field. What is the purpose of accreditation: to define a minimum standard and multiply the number of agencies that meet it? Is it to set a high standard which will encourage good programs but discourage the rest? If it is the latter, it is possible to set our standards unrealistically high, and thus be so out of touch with the reality of the profession as to lose the power to influence and to lead. But to lead, you must be out in front. How far is too far? How far is not far enough? These are the questions with which the COA is now wrestling, and to which — presumably — my office can also devote some attention which may help the COA to come to some answers.

These are, in a way, problems of library education with which we have always been faced, and are likely to be faced in the future no matter what our current decisions. After all, ALA's concern with library education did not come to light for the first time in 1966 with the creation of the OLE. Discussions of library education were held informally from the first meeting of the ALA in 1876, and in 1882

there was a formal paper on education problems before the entire conference. In 1883, Melvil Dewey proposed his library school, and the president of the Association appointed a Committee on the Proposed School of Library Economy, which may be said to be the grand-daddy of all the several committees, sections, departments, boards, divisions, round tables and offices which have come into being in the intervening years. As early as 1900, the Committee on Library Training was charged with visiting the existing schools and making recommendations for change and improvement (foreshadowing the present COA), and in 1909, a Section on Professional Training for Librarianship was established to provide the broader membership participation now represented by the LED (established 1946). I have no intention of trying to work my way through the several different units that have been created during the past ninety years in an attempt to cope with the problems of library education, but it is both amusing and consoling to see half a century ago a sub-committee on the training of catalogers; a school librarian's section to deal with the special training needed by that group; a committee of college and university librarians advocating an advanced school of librarianship to meet their special needs; a business librarians' round table demanding the establishment of a course for business librarians, etc. *Plus ca change; plus c'est la meme chose.*

Still, one cannot shake the conviction that, timeless as these problems may be, they are made more difficult and more urgent by certain current developments, many of which Mr. Cory identified this morning. There is, for example, the application to library services of new technology and new devices which are sufficiently revolutionary as to raise a question whether a whole new profession of information science has not come into being. Jack Dalton has suggested the variety of ways in which schools are attempting to meet this challenge. My present position is to cast my lot with those whom Jack characterized as using the "assimilative approach;" that group which sees this as a modern development within librarianship, opening up new ways of doing traditional things, introducing some new things to do, and generally challenging the tradition in its details but not its major objectives. The big problem is to determine in which ways we can preserve what is valuable out of the old while adapting what is useful out of the new. I would like to encourage experimentation and innovation, without abandoning values that

have always stood for the best in librarianship. All we really need is time and intelligence — commodities always in short supply.

Another complicating factor in the contemporary scene is the rapidly increasing move towards specialization in all fields, including that of librarianship. It was this perhaps more than any other thing that really intimidated me when I first moved into the new office. Within minutes, so to speak, after the announcement of my appointment, I began to hear from the several special fields. The first were the school librarians — or rather, one group within the school library field — who urged that the Office for Library Education move at once to recognize the completely unique character of the school librarians' curriculum which 1) could not utilize the courses used for the preparation of other librarians and 2) must be encompassed within the four-year degree program. This, it turned out, is not the unanimous opinion of the school librarians, another group of whom feel that they should *not* be taught, for example, cataloging for school librarians but rather general principles of cataloging, and should be required to go on to the fifth year master's as the first qualifying degree. Next came the junior college librarians whose needs — they say — are not met by courses designed for college librarians nor for school librarians. But college librarians, it appears, are not taken care of properly by the present library schools whose courses, *they* say, are primarily designed for university librarians. University librarians, on the other hand, see the schools concerned only with public libraries. "Maybe so," say the librarians of small public libraries, "but the emphasis is on the large public libraries, and thus irrelevant to our needs." As for the special librarians — well, none of the library schools is giving the special librarians what they need, of course. . . . The same gamut of discontent is run by those whose emphasis is on function rather than type of library: the reference librarians vs. the circulation librarians vs. the acquisitions people vs. the adult service specialist, etc., etc. After a bit of that one begins to see why the library schools have tended to stick with the little-bit-of-everything pattern of traditional core programs. Not that the present program satisfies anybody, but at least it dissatisfies less than almost any other solution would.

Yet another complicating factor is the sudden recognition of libraries by contemporary society. Take the matter of federal legislation supporting libraries, and the demand for more libraries, more services, and more trained people that it requires. This is what we

have always wanted — and now that we have it we are not at all prepared to take advantage of it. The increased demand for school librarians alone, for example, leads us to state our requirements in terms so astronomically high as to suggest that no solution is possible at all. Thus the pressure on the schools to turn out more people sooner, just to cover the desks. And thus the pressure to accredit more schools, before the government decides to do it for us in order to broaden the area of eligibility for federal support. These are understandable reactions to the pressures, but I hope that we won't be pushed by extraneous considerations to commitments that will jeopardize our future. There is always a danger in temporary expedients that may become permanent models. Remember it was another manpower shortage in the 1880's that led to the training-classes-approach to library education that we are still trying to live down.

As a matter of fact, this concern with our status as a profession seems to me today to be one of our most burdensome impedimenta. I realize that this was almost forced on us by the fact that an image of shabby genteel clerical skills had become so firmly established in the public mind. But whenever one attempts to change the pattern of education for librarianship, or the table of organization within a library, or the titles of jobs and the assignment of duties, he runs smack up against the question of the image of the professional. At a recent conference I suggested that some of our course work might be offered within the four-year program — to be greeted by the question meant as refutation: how can we call ourselves a profession if we don't require a fifth-year program? The question was not whether we need a fifth-year program for what we want to accomplish (incidentally, I think we need that and more), but rather, what would people say? The same kind of objection is raised against almost every proposal to alter the status quo: not what does librarianship need, but rather, what do other professions do? I wish we might drop the term "profession" completely from our considerations for a while, and concentrate on what we want to accomplish, and what is required to accomplish it. Then — and only then — should we look to see if what is most desirable from the standpoint of our maximum service fits preconceived notions about what professions do and require. It could just be that we are not a profession, by analogy with other accepted professions. But if we perform an essential service to society, at a high level of expertise and special knowledge, will it really matter so much whether we call our-

selves a profession or not? As we stand now, I fear that that is really all we have been able to accomplish so far in this matter: *we* call *ourselves* a profession. Does anyone else?

As you can guess, I have placed some of the problems of library education in the worst possible light for rhetorical purposes. If I want to gain your sympathy and your indulgence as my office moves much too slowly in these matters, I have to make it seem a terribly difficult task. I think there is no question that it is difficult. The major challenge however, more than the difficulties of the individual problems, is the number of the problems and the question of their priority. How can we start until we have a definition? How can we wait until a definition is forthcoming? Who should change first: the schools, which may then be turning out people whose qualifications can not be utilized; or the libraries, which will then be unable to find people qualified to handle their new positions? Can we wait until the graduate programs are revised before beginning to prepare suitable programs for the undergraduate level? Can programs at the undergraduate level be designed sensibly until we know for what kind of graduate programs they are the introduction? If I remember my college psychology courses, it is this kind of decision-crises that lead most frequently to nervous breakdown. Thus far, by spending most of my time reporting these problems to others rather than trying to face them in my office, I seem to be safe enough from nervous breakdown myself — but I'm probably a first-class carrier.

If the spectrum of problems seems to you to be an extremely broad one (an opinion with which I am in hearty accord), I can only say that the trends in librarianship as I read them seem to point to a growing willingness on our parts to confront this broader challenge. Indeed, the word "spectrum" appears in recommendations growing out of a recent conference on library manpower cosponsored by my office and the LAD. One of the major recommendations from that meeting was that the profession has the responsibility to provide leadership and establish standards for training and education for the entire library occupation, of which the library profession is a part. Taking a cue from the experience in nursing education and in preparation for the profession of social work, it was pointed out that only the highest level of a profession can keep the objectives high, and that therefore the highest level must control the content at the lower levels, planning and evaluating the

whole college preparation with the end professional objective in view.

For librarianship, this is — or could be — a revolutionary proposal. It specifically rejects the present system which is concerned only with the content of graduate-level "professional" courses, turning its back (as the discussions of the conference described it) on a large and important segment of the field. This does not mean that the Committee on Accreditation is expected to accredit all programs at all levels, but it does mean that the work of the COA must take cognizance of the total preparation for library practice. It does not mean that there must be a prescribed program throughout the four years of college for anyone who expects to make librarianship his career, but it does mean that there should be better guidance and counselling all along the line, and that the student should be able to plan his program from the beginning with his career objectives in view. In other words, the conference is saying that we ought to mean what we say. Our standards have proclaimed all along that the basic program of education for librarianship covers five years of study beyond the secondary school. The recommendation suggests that we have responsibility for more serious concern with those five years than merely requiring a "B" average from Nonentity Teachers College, or evidence that the applicant has taken the Graduate Record Exam — with no regard for his scores and his performance.

There is another implication in this recommendation: that preparation for librarianship could be — as our standards have always suggested — one fifth of the five-year program, and not necessarily in the format of four plus one. I do not wish to get into the details of these implications at the moment; the last time I even hinted in public at the possibility of undergraduate courses in librarianship, I was immediately quoted widely as favoring the old Type III schools, and an undergraduate major of 18 credits. I did not — I do not — say any of those specific things. All I do say is that we need to look at preparation for a career in librarianship without preconceptions, to see what needs to be taught, at what level it can be taught, and who can benefit from the training. And if some of you fear that people with limited undergraduate training will prove to be just as competent and just as effective as people with full graduate education in librarianship — remember, *you* said it; I didn't. Nor do I believe it.

Well, this has been an informal tour with gun and camera through the jungle of library education. There have been several spur-of-the-moment side trips, and the typically inadequate and surface information that one usually gets from guided tours. Which raises the question, I suppose, of just how much leadership will the Office for Library Education provide in these tangled matters? "Leadership" is a word that has been bandied about a great deal in relation to the role of my office, and I am not sure that everyone is agreed on the meaning of the term. As I interpret the kind of "leadership" that an ALA office should supply, it partakes of a catalytic character far more than it does a dictatorial one. I do not mean to be excessively permissive, but I do hope that my role of leadership will be to urge other units of the ALA to do the work they are charged to do, rather than to turn it over to my office to accomplish. ALA, as you know, is NOT 50 East Huron Street. It is all of its members, and to involve more of its members actively in the problems of library education would seem to me to be the best thing my office could do in meeting its objective: an "enlarged" program is library education and related fields. Through occasions like this one, to speak to the real ALA, it is possible to make the first steps. I wish to thank you for giving me this opportunity.

Reports of Discussion Groups

Group No. 1 PERSONNEL
Leader: Philip S. Ogilvie, Librarian
North Carolina State Library
Recorder: Nicholas Gaymon, Librarian
Dillard University

The report of the Joint Ad Hoc Committee of the Library Administration and the Library Education Division of ALA was introduced at a proper starting point for the discussion of personnel needs. The assumptions of the report were read and used as a point of departure for discussion. The initial point made was that the size of a library staff has specific bearing on the application of the assumptions. For example, in-service training of library technicians or assistants is more practical where there is a large staff.

The group then addressed itself to three basic questions:

1. What are the various types of personnel needs that can be identified?
2. What qualifications are needed for each of the various types of personnel needs?
3. How can individuals with these qualifications be identified?

It was difficult to define personnel needs without getting involved in the areas of the other three discussion groups, education, specialization, and cooperation. Because it seemed easier to identify personnel needs in terms of types of libraries, the group divided into three sections: (1) school libraries, (2) academic and special libraries, and (3) public libraries. Library school faculty members participated in each section.

The personnel needs identified by each section were reported to the whole group as follows:

1. Personnel needs for school libraries
   a. Personnel for state leadership, i.e., for positions in state departments of education, as state school library consultants, etc.
   b. Personnel for administrative leadership on the system level, i.e., in a county or city or in a combined school district.
   c. Personnel at the location of service level, i.e., in the school libraries.

d. Professional, non-professional and clerical personnel would be needed at the levels described in a., b., and c.

e. Personnel at all levels should have competencies in working with book and non-book materials.

2. Personnel needs for academic and special libraries

   a. The head librarian or chief administrator

   b. Professional librarians as department heads and line employees.

   c. Specialists, i.e., persons with or without courses in librarianship, but with special competencies to contribute to overall library efficiency at the service or management levels.

   d. Technical assistants and/or library assistants

   e. Clerical employees for routine library-related work.

3. Personnel needs for public libraries

   a. The library director (a generalist with administrative ability.)

   b. Professional librarians with areas of specialization in either subjects or types of service, i.e., in such subjects as business, fine arts, or science and technology and in-service areas such as, children's work, technical services, or reference work.

   c. Specialists, i.e., professional personnel without formal library education such as artists, accountants, personnel managers, etc.

   d. Library assistants, personnel with liberal arts backgrounds or a needed speciality who have been trained on the job and have come up through the ranks as career clerks.

   e. Clerical personnel with competencies in the performance of clerical duties such as typing, filing and operating duplicating equipment.

Group No. 2 EDUCATION
Leader: Mrs. Annette H. Phinazee, Professor, School of Library Service, Atlanta University
Recorder: Miss H. Joanne Harrar, Librarian, Winthrop College

The following questions were discussed:

1. What are the various types of educational and/or training needs?
2. What objectives will best translate these needs into effective programs?
3. What kinds of programs can best meet these objectives?
4. What content is essential to these programs?
5. How can these programs be evaluated?

Preliminary discussion was centered upon methods of achieving the cooperative effort in the Southeast which is essential to superior library education. There was consensus that an ordered plan should be created, based upon an informed knowledge of the needs of local, state and regional areas.

Group 2 recommended that the full-time position of field representative in library education be established in and for the Southeast. The contributions of the Carnegie Corporation and the activities of Tommie Dora Barker were recalled. The responsibilities of this position should include:

1. Stimulation of recruitment for librarianship.
2. Assistance in the proper soliciting and expending of funds for library education.
3. Evaluation of library education and training programs.
4. Promotion of communication among library school faculties and library personnel.

Education and/or Training Needs

The following types of programs were identified:

1. Full-time programs
2. Summer programs

3. Institutes, workshops, short courses (primarily for continuing education)
4. In-service and on-the-job training programs

The following levels of programs were discussed:

1. Graduate programs — Ph.D., sixth year, fifth year
2. Undergraduate programs
3. Vocational level (high school, junior college) programs

Objectives

Some of the objectives that might translate these needs into effective programs are to:

1. Provide quality service in the quest for information.
2. Establish and maintain communication between practicing librarians and library educators.
3. Recognize and accept the specialized areas of librarianship, delineating those areas for which library educators must accept responsibility.
4. Determine the levels for which library educators should be concerned.
5. Establish standards for library education programs that will meet the above objectives.

Programs

The following types of library personnel were recognized and an outline of the kinds of educational programs which are considered to be appropriate for them are given below:

1. *Educators*

   The need to identify potential educators and to encourage their development was underscored. Current sources of financial support from the federal government for scholarships to be used in the preparation of library educators were explained.

   a. The doctoral degree is strongly recommended.
   b. The sixth-year degree should be required for all persons teaching in library schools and in library science depart-

ments. Educational requirements for library educators should be equal to those for teaching personnel in other departments of the institution in which the program of librarianship is located.

c. Depending upon the area of specialization, the fifth-year degree in librarianship together with a master's degree in a subject field may satisfy the educational requirements for educators.

2. *Administrators*

a. The fifth-year degree is considered to be the minimum requirement.

b. The sixth-year or doctoral degree may be required, depending upon the size and type of library.

c. The fifth-year degree in librarianship may be coupled with the basic professional degree in the appropriate subject field for administrators of specialized types of libraries such as education, law, medicine, etc.

3. *Professional supportive staff*

The minimum of a fifth-year degree either in librarianship or in a specialized field should be required.

4. *Technical assistants*

Two to four years of college, including, or supplemented by, the core of courses in librarianship should be required.

5. *Library clerks*

High-school graduation with a short-term course in library routines should be required.

Programs for the continuing education of all levels of educators and library personnel, in the form of workshops, institutes, and the like, are recommended.

Content

1. *Doctoral program*

The need to offer the doctoral degree in the Southeast was recognized and the development of a strong program was urged. The graduate library school having the supportive fac-

ulty, facilities, and collections should be encouraged to initiate such a program.

2. *Sixth-year program*

   The demand for additional programs at this level was apparent. The present programs are developed for individuals matriculating for the degree; however, Group 2 urged that they be geared to specific areas of librarianship, with each school concentrating in at least one field. By this means the strengths of each institution could be utilized, duplication of effort could be reduced or eliminated, and strong coverage of more areas could be made available within the region.

   Further study of the needs to be met by such programs and of the schools to offer them should be initiated.

3. *Fifth-year program*

   a. As preparation for this program, the student should have completed a strong undergraduate program in liberal arts, including a subject major.

   b. The program should include foundation courses in the major aspects of librarianship (book selection, cataloging, reference, administration, history of librarianship). Particular emphasis should be placed on bibliography, which Group 2 considered to be the focus of the fifth-year program.

   c. A course in research methods, requiring some practical experience, should be included.

   d. Limited programs of depth specialization, as in the information sciences, should be included.

4. *Undergraduate program*

   a. The program should be limited to a minor, the number of hours involved depending upon the individual institution. The ALA standards should be referred to for guidance.

   b. The following objectives for the program were agreed upon:

      (1) To recruit for the fifth-year program.

      (2) To train library assistants and teacher-librarians.

5. *Junior college program*

This should be a short-term course, using at least minimum content of the program proposed in the Deininger Report.

Evaluation

Evaluation could take place in a regional center which could be established, preferably, on the campus of the institution offering the doctoral program. That center would, among other functions, cooperate with the national center described in the Deininger Report.

Group No. 3—SPECIALIZATION

Leader: Dale L. Barker, Systems Analyst Library, University of Georgia
Recorder: Irvin Simpkins, Science Librarian Emory University

Of the many specialized activities in which librarians engage — too numerous to examine closely — Group No. 3 looked for new specializations which might warrant attention and for old specializations in which needs were felt to be great. The total list of existing specializations, of course, make up a great array. In broad categories, these were reviewed by types of libraries (public, school, etc.), by function (cataloging, reference, administration, etc.), by type or level of user (children's, etc.), by form of material (newspaper, map, etc.), and by subject (from archeology to zoology). Of all these the Group chose to discuss, with a view toward making recommendations to educators, the following topics: (1) Subject specialization, (2) Systems study and automation, (3) Information retrieval, (4) Specialization by type of libraries, and (5) Specialization by form of material. Some of these were, expectedly, more fruitful than others in recommendations for action.

Subject specialization. — In the important area of subject specialization, the Group supported the prevailing pattern whereby formal subject preparation of subject specialists either precedes or follows the regular period of library education in accordance with the educational pattern of the subject discipline concerned. Notice was taken of the usual broad subject bibliography courses in library school curricula and of occasional courses in the bibliography of more specialized fields. Library educators are urged by the Group to take greater advantage of the university environment in which

they operate to engage instructors from subject disciplines on shared appointments or by other arrangements. It was felt that directors of libraries might, where opportunity exists, contribute to the subject competence of librarians by encouraging staff members to take courses, attend workshops, and otherwise take advantage of educational opportunities.

Systems study and automation. — The Group next took up the related areas of systems study and management science, which are making themselves felt in our libraries and which often lead to the automation of library procedures. These affect us all, and the need for education in these areas was recognized by librarians of all specialties in the Group. The large libraries are beginning to add new specialists, called library systems analysts, data processing librarians, and other names. Smaller libraries are feeling the impact because often they are parts of larger systems — such as school systems or military library networks — with prospects of automation, or else they often participate in cooperative programs involving automation.

Instruction in these areas is already developing — at various levels — in some library schools, and it is expected that this will continue to grow and spread. It is recommended that library schools increase and intensify this instruction both in special courses and as integral parts of administration, cataloging, and other courses.

Because the acquisition of faculty for these specialties will be difficult for most library schools, it is suggested that — as for subject specialists — efforts be made to engage instructors part-time or on a shared basis from management, computer, or other university departments.

The Group viewed the need for systems and automation competence in libraries as a phenomenon which will pass through stages as adjustments are made in libraries and library schools. The present situation is such that, even as programs are being developed for library school students, measures must also be taken for the more immediate benefit of practicing librarians. A program of continuing education is recommended which will include workshops, short courses, and institutes, as well as more formal programs. This was regarded as a great need. And so it is strongly recommended that the national associations concerned with professional problems — ALA, SLA, and ADI — be urged to assume re-

57

sponsibility for coordinating these special instructional programs nationwide until such time as people in the field begin to catch up and the need subsides. This coordination should especially provide for programs *within* regions so as to bring instruction closer to librarians in this and all geographic areas.

It was expected by the Group that for some time many larger libraries would have to hire systems and computer specialists from outside the library field to assist in their systems-upgrading efforts. This could become an opportunity for mutual education as the recruited specialists learn about this new area for the application of their expertise and as the librarians learn new techniques for performing old tasks.

Information retrieval. — The third specialization examined by the Group was the area of information storage and retrieval, which in recent years has begun to affect library thinking and library operations. The Group noted the progress already being made in library school curricula. It was recommended that instruction in special courses be extended, but also that IR and information science concepts be introduced and blended with the content of existing bibliography and other courses. An article by Raynard C. Swank in the January 1967 issue of *Special Libraries* was cited as indicative of the blending of old and new concepts which should be undertaken.

It was also recommended that additional workshops and institutes be held for the benefit of librarians in the field.

Specialization by type of library. — While specialized curricula for the preparation of librarians for specific types of libraries were not recommended, there was strong sentiment that additional specialized courses are needed, particularly for school librarianship and special librarianship. There was some feeling in the Group favoring specialized courses in administration, e.g., administration of school libraries, or administration of special libraries. For library schools in which only general administration courses are taught, the practice of team teaching is recommended.

It is recommended that every library school attempt to include a school library specialist in its faculty. Similar specialists were considered desirable for the training of special librarians, but in view of the difficulties expected in recruiting, a program is recommended which would include lectures by invited special librarians, visits

to special libraries by students, and follow-up study with assignments, readings, and reports.

The Group unanimously rejected a suggestion that each library school specialize in a particular area and devote itself to the production of a single type of fifth-year librarian.

The Group recommended to library schools that, where feasible, they consider the exchange of teachers with different areas of competence.

Specialization by form of material. — With respect to the forms of materials handled by libraries, the principal concern expressed in the Group was for technical reports and for some of the new communication and educational media. Library schools are urged to be alert in assessing the requirements of new forms — and the changing requirements of old forms — and to be sensitive to the varying effects of form on the flow and control of information.

Other recommendations. — Besides these topics, identified as specializations, a few additional questions were raised which led to recommendations.

The Group strongly recommends the encouragement of sixth-year programs as being of particular value to specialists because of the difficulty of incorporating sufficient specialized course work in the fifth-year curriculum.

Finally, suggestions were solicited from members of the Group for areas of possible research bearing on the training and use of library specialists. Proposals were made for:

1. Studies of teaching techniques, e.g., programmed instruction, with a view to possible improvement of curricula to make room for more specialized courses.
2. Studies of what library personnel of all specialties in libraries actually do, with the object of improving performance.
3. Studies of the effect of large library and communication networks on present library practices and personnel needs.

Group No. 4 COOPERATION

Leader: **Mrs. Frances N. Cheney**
Professor
Library School
George Peabody College for Teachers

Recorder: **Miss Margaret L. Walker**
Library Consultant
Georgia State Department of Education

The chairman used as a point of departure a comprehensive resumé of the three addresses delivered the previous day. The group was divided into sub-groups A and B. Group A centered its discussion around the question, "What does the profession expect of library education agencies?" Group B reacted to the question, "What areas of cooperation are appropriate among library schools, library science departments, libraries, and state library agencies and associations?"

Group A enumerated the following expectations relative to library-school graduates:

1. Strong backgrounds in liberal arts, with some depth in specific subject areas.
2. Working knowledge of the principles and fundamentals of library management such as management routines, budget making, application of basic principles of tax structure, knowledge of political processes, and the organization of public library and public school systems.
3. Ability to assume roles of leadership in cooperating with library education agencies in their continuous in-service training programs based on changing needs.

Group A also pointed out that the profession expected library education agencies to assume the following responsibilities:

1. Exercise more care in screening students admitted to library schools and to library science departments.
2. Establish well organized and carefully defined placement programs to assist graduates in securing their first positions and in advancing to other positions throughout their professional careers.
3. Provide opportunities for practice work or periods of internship in selected "teaching laboratories" in the region (school, academic, special, and public libraries).

4. Conduct well planned and coordinated institutes, workshops and conferences in the region to provide continuing education programs to keep library personnel in the region abreast of changes in objectives, services, materials and technology.

Group B discussed two areas of cooperation among library schools, library science departments, libraries, state library agencies, and library associations; namely, more cooperation in recruitment in the region and more publicity relative to financial assistance available to library school students.

Dr. Louis Shores presented for the group's reaction "A Regional Plan for Library Education" (see Appendix).

In conclusion, Group 4 drew up the following resolution, which was presented to the Conference on Library Education in the South:

That this Conference urge the Southeastern Library Association to establish a Council on Regional Planning for Library Education, whose members would include at least one representative from each of the nine member states and from Louisiana, library practitioners of various types, library educators at various levels and laymen from related agencies, e.g., state boards of education. That, in turn, this Council on Regional Planning for Library Education seek funds from appropriate sources, e.g., Rockefeller Foundation, to establish at the earliest possible date a Southeastern Developmental Center for Library and Information Sciences for at least a five-year period.

That the staff of this Center be concerned with:

1. A manpower study
   a. Training and utilization of manpower.
   b. Endorsing the Deininger Report (Report of the Joint Ad Hoc Committee of LAD and LED on Sub-professional or Technical Class of Library Employees).
2. Levels of library education needed or presently existing in the region, specifically:
   a. Doctoral programs.
   b. Undergraduate and graduate library school articulation.
   c. Sixth-year programs.

d. The Master of Education degree with a major in library science.

e. Audio-visual library education and articulation.

f. Information science and library education articulation.

g. Library technician programs (terminal and/or basic).

h. Education of the laity relative to the objectives, functions and support of libraries.

i. Improvement and enlargement of existing library schools and regional planning for the establishment of future schools.

j. Coordination of plans for continuing education in the region, e.g., institutes and workshops and the preparation and dissemination of calendars of such activities.

3. Recruitment

4. Stimulation of cooperative programs among various types of libraries in the region.

5. Assistance in the identification of program needs.

6. Cooperation with existing and future related regional and national agencies, both governmental and non-governmental, e.g., SREB, ALA, USDE.

7. A clearing house for the exchange of information, including maintenance of a roster of specialists in various types of libraries and library services.

8. Research, including

   a. Working with graduate library schools in identifyng needed areas of research.

   b. Working with the ERIC clearing house.

Conference Summary

Sarah R. Reed
Library Education Specialist
U. S. Office of Education

In splendid addresses by three men — who follow in the true Wilson tradition of the gentleman-scholar — and in a day of lively group discussions, conference participants have caught a glimpse of things to come in the world of libraries and library education, have acquired increased visibility of the problems to be solved and of the resources with which to seek satisfactory solutions to these problems, and have experienced a renewed awareness of the vitality of Southern library leadership. The quality of this leadership is remarkable but not unexpected. During recent decades you have demonstrated repeatedly the ability to deal effectively with complex and pressing library problems. Moreover the talents and the accomplishments which you represent have frequently been recognized nationally. Here today, for example, are two former presidents of the American Library Association, the president of the Association of American Library Schools and recipients of outstanding awards including both the Beta Phi Mu Award for Distinguished Service to Education for Librarianship and the Beta Phi Mu Good Teaching Award.

In passing, two other aspects of this conference might be noted which are characteristic of library conferences and library programming in the South. First is the recognition and utilization of the very special contributions which can be made by national library leaders such as John Cory and Jack Dalton, who have come from the South and who are fully aware of the role of Southern library planning and development and its relation to the national scene.

A second characteristic is the assembling of appropriate resource people. Your Conference Planning Committee has brought together here all living past and future Executive Secretaries of the Library Education Division of the American Library Association, the Director of the new ALA Office for Library Education, and the first person to serve as Library Education Specialist of the U. S. Office of Education. Among these same resource people are represented all living past and present ALA staff secretaries for the Committee on Accreditation.

Recognizing the impressive record and the marked potential of Southern library leadership, it is not surprising to find a full com-

63

plement of state library leaders meeting here to identify problems and needs in all areas of preparation of library personnel and to explore means for achieving a program of continuing evaluation and development for library education in the South.

From Mr. Cory's excellent discussion of national and regional trends and problems, it is apparent that the magnitude of the problems faced by librarians and by library educators, both in the South and elsewhere, cannot be solved with local resources or with piecemeal measures. Mr. Cory identified some of the architectural devices for designing and operating Dean Shores' Library 21. He indicated too that to provide the kinds of library programs that will bring all needed information — albeit for a longer reach for exceptional materials and for exceptional users — to the intellectual majority will require more and better librarians — better training in that the general library education will be strengthened, the combinations of library and subject specializations will be extended in number and depth, and doctoral programs will be increased and expanded. The end product, whether a skilful generalist or specialist, will be more versatile.

Everyone here seems to agree that librarians must work towards the development of a network of libraries and information centers to meet the needs of the users of Library 21. No one wants to see the library subordinate to a composite educational and informational network. As conference participants you have glimpsed a possible new dimension for the library as every man's university. You have recognized too that to combine the art and science of librarianship into a successful blend to achieve this new dimension will require a considerable range of competencies for the librarians of Library 21. These librarians must have a thorough understanding of the total community in which the library has its being, an insight into the needs and characteristics of the individual user, the ability to use the tools of technology to serve the library user, the political astuteness, and the managerial talents to achieve the blending of human and material resources requisite to excellent library programming.

Librarians today are well acquainted with blueprints. In few fields is there greater potential for getting and taking advantage of massive support for research and development — on local, state, regional, and federal levels, or by various combinations of these and

yet other means of support. The grand scale of the library blueprints which can be drafted from the ideas presented here will tax the social and educational leadership of the South. By your attendance at this conference you have in a sense recognized that the unacceptable alternative to Mr. Cory's promised land is — dodoland — a point of no return — that unless librarians and library educators meet the challenges of time and place in terms of instantaneous access and in terms of equal cultural advancement, others will take up the library standard with no assurance that Dean Wilson's liberalizing library philosophy will prevail.

Dean Dalton described three problem areas common to library education nationally: (1) the problems of library manpower which are related to similar problems in other professions; (2) the implications of the impact of mechanization, miniaturization, and computerization for librarianship; and (3) the responsibilities of librarianship as a multi-faceted discipline concerned with the world of communication, the materials, the users, and the librarians who by combining the art, science and skills of librarianship can mediate successfully between man and his cumulative graphic record, whether it be for (a) joy, (b) understanding, or (c) knowledge.

Out of Dean Dalton's discussion of library problems peculiar to the South rises a conviction that these problems will be resolved well only if they are attacked here where they have immediacy.

Questions growing out of Dean Dalton's remarks include the following: What is a library? At what levels will this library's personnel work? What will they be taught? What group or groups will provide opportunities for their continuing education? How can all the pieces of the educational and manpower puzzle be fitted together with vision, intelligence, insight, and creativity? Who will identify and carry on the research needed to buttress graduate library education and library operations? How will cooperation and coordination of efforts to develop and maintain quality programming for libraries and library education be achieved? Would a Southern field representative be useful? What is SELA's role?

In 1970 it will have been fifty years since Dr. C. C. Williamson visited all library education programs and formulated guidelines relating to the placement of library education in institutions of higher education to achieve the academic excellence, the multi-faceted and interdisciplinary educational programming which you have talked

about here. In 1970 too it will have been twenty years since the major work on the *Standards for Accreditation* was completed. Certainly it is time for the American Library Association to focus its attention once again upon library manpower — recruitment, utilization, formal education, and continuing education. With the establishment of the Office for Library Education, the Association has provided for an enlarged program in library education and related fields. We are indeed fortunate to have as participants in this conference and as the first Director of this new ofice, Dr. Lester Asheim, and as the first Executive Secretary of the Library Education Division under this new office, Dr. Agnes Reagan. These two people of outstanding ability will provide the caliber of leadership essential for the success of this new level of national planning and development for library education. In his report here Dr. Asheim has stressed the importance of recent evidences of recognition by the library profession of its responsibility for the full gamut of educational preparation for all levels of library personnel and to some extent at least, professional concern for preventing the misuse of library personnel. Dr. Asheim has emphasized too the role of this Office as a clearinghouse for information on all matters relating to his field of responsibility, as a means of coordinating the various activities relevant to education and training, and as a kind of devil's advocate *par excellence* to encourage study, experimentation, and the temerity to hold to the best that can be developed.

Very briefly the major guidelines formulated during the full day of group meetings are as follow:

Group I: *Personnel.* Group I fully recognized the need (a) for identifying and recruiting good people in all levels of library positions; (b) for making certain that qualifications and training programs are appropriate in relation to tasks to be assigned; and (c) for creative utilization of personnel. This group considered the impact of social, political, economic, and technological change upon library personnel and identified the major types of personnel needed as to administrators, middle management, generalists, subject and service specialists, career clerks (library technical assistants) general clerks, and professionals from other fields.

Group II: *Education.* Group II called for well ordered planning for all levels of library education and training based on full knowledge of state and regional needs for pre-service, in-service, and con-

tinuing education needs; for the reactivation of a field representative in library education; for maintaining communication between library schools and library administrators; for recognizing specialized areas of librarianship and their implications for library education; for delineating areas and levels for which library education programs should assume responsibility; for establishing and maintaining standards to achieve objectives; and for providing a center for evaluation which would cooperate with the ALA Office for Library Education. This group also outlined and discussed educational programming for the library school faculty member, the library administrator, the generalist, the subject field specialist, the library technical assistant, and the clerk.

Group III: *Specialization*. Group III recommended for both preservice and continuing education in the South the establishment and development of the various specializations needed, whether by type of library, by function, by user, by subject field, or by form of material. To achieve breadth and depth in course offerings, Group III urged the recruitment on each library school faculty of competent specialists in each of the areas for which programs of specialization are offered; the use of specialists from other professions as well as from among library practitioners; the exchange of teachers with special areas of competence; team teaching; interdisciplinary approaches; the development of appropriate sixth-year programs; research to improve educational programming for library specialization; and the development of competence in library technology and information processing both through special courses and the blending of the new concepts and information into existing curricula.

Group IV: *Cooperation*. Group IV concluded its far-ranging deliberations by formulating two recommendations for consideration by conference participants. The first proposal was that conference participants recommend to SELA the establishment of a council on regional planning and development for library education in the South. The second was that such a council seek foundation support to establish a Southeastern Developmental Center for Library and Information Science with full support for a minimum of five years to support the development and maintenance of quality library and library education programs in the South.

The charges suggested for the proposed council reflect Group IV's discussion and included the following:

1. A study of manpower training and utlization
2. A study of levels and varieties of training including means for strengthening such programs and the development of a calendar of needed opportunities for continuing education
3. The geographic distribution of programs including the location of a strong doctoral program.
4. Recruitment
5. Coordination with planning and development in other regions and at the national level, including LSCA Title III activities
6. Clearing house function, including the development of a roster of specialists
7. Research and development

Group IV suggested that council membership might reflect the ten states represented at this Conference, that interaction between library educators and practitioners be assured, and that there be competent lay representation.

This Conference has afforded a vision of library and librarian 21, greater visibility of library and library education problems and resources, and a demonstration of the enduring vitality of Southern library leadership. Emerging from the group discussions is agreement as to the responsibility of the library profession (1) for effective preparation and utilization of library manpower at all levels; (2) for providing opportunity for a continuing dialogue between educators and practitioners; and (3) for establishing a regional center for planning, research, and development (a) to support quality programming for libraries and for library education; (b) to serve as a clearing house; and (c) to provide coordination of all levels.

Conference participants were in agreement too concerning the essential elements of quality library education for librarian 21 — liberal arts preparation, subject specialization and professional education which represents a focused educational experience in terms of a changing milieu rather than series of fragmented course offerings. They conceived this programming as interdisciplinary in nature and as utilizing as appropriate the total available educational resources to achieve breadth and depth in librarianship and related fields.

They stressed the importance of effective programs of continuing education for the foreseeable future.

Some lack of agreement on such matters as the type of training for the library career clerk (library technical assistant) and the best format for sixth-year programs for library specialists combined with the need to strengthen library education at all levels and to examine the geographic distribution of programs suggests the importance of establishing the kind of ongoing program for research and development to support library operations and library education in the South suggested at this Conference. Such a program can be realized only if adequate human and material resources can be assembled under sound, continuing sponsorship and detailed to its implementation. Given some such sponsorship as the Southeastern Developmental Center for Library and Information Science proposed by discussion Group IV and the implementation of the best of the kinds of research and development suggested here in these two and one-half days of meetings, the promised land for library and librarian 21 will not prove a mirage but a very happy reality.

Conference Program

LIBRARY EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH

A Conference Sponsored by

School of Library Service, Atlanta University

with the Cooperation of

Division of Librarianship, Emory University

APRIL 20-22, 1967
PASCHAL'S MOTOR HOTEL
830 HUNTER STREET, S. W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30314

66

'70

Thursday, April 20, 1967

9:30 A.M. REGISTRATION. Matador Room.

10:30 A.M. OPENING SESSION. Matador Room.

Presiding: Mrs. Hallie B. Brooks,
Associate Professor,
School of Library Service, Atlanta University

Greetings: Mrs. Virginia L. Jones, *Dean,*
School of Library Service, Atlanta University
A. Venable Lawson, *Director,*
Division of Librarianship, Emory University

Address: "*Regional Problems Related to Library Education in the South*"
John Cory, *Deputy Director,*
The New York Public Library

Discussion Period

12:30 P.M. Lunch. Sherwood Room.

2:00 P.M. SECOND SESSION. Matador Room.

Presiding: A. Venable Lawson

Address: "*Problem Areas in Library Education*"
Jack Dalton, *Dean,* School of Library Service,
Columbia University

Discussion Period

6:30 P.M. COCKTAIL HOUR. Carrousel Lounge.
Guests of Bro-Dart

7:30 P.M. CONFERENCE BANQUET. Matador Room.

Presiding: Mrs. Virginia L. Jones

Address: "*The Role of the ALA Office of Library Education*"—Lester Asheim,
Director, ALA Office of Library Education

71

Friday, April 21, 1967

9:00 A.M. GROUP MEETINGS

Group No. 1. PERSONNEL. Section I, Matador Room.

Leader: Philip S. Ogilvie, *Librarian,* North Carolina State Library

Recorder: Nicholas Gaymon, *Librarian,* Dillard University

Group No. 2: EDUCATION. Section II Matador Room.

Leader: Mrs. Annette H. Phinazee, *Professor,* School of Library Service, Atlanta University

Recorder: Miss H. Joanne Harrar, *Librarian,* Winthrop College

Group No. 3. SPECIALIZATION. Section III, Matador Room.

Leader: Dale Barker, *Library Systems Analyst* and *Science Librarian,* University of Georgia

Recorder: Irwin Simpkins, *Science Librarian,* Emory University

Group No. 4. COOPERATION. Executive Suite, 5th Floor.

Leader: Mrs. Frances N. Cheney, *Professor,* Library School, George Peabody College for Teachers

Recorder: Miss Margaret L. Walker, *Library Consultant,* Georgia State Department of Education

12:30 P.M. Lunch. Sherwood Room.

2:00-

5:00 P.M. CONTINUATION OF GROUP MEETINGS

Saturday, April 22, 1967

9:00 A.M. CLOSING SESSION. Dean Sage Hall,
Atlanta University.
Presiding: John Clemons, *Associate Professor,*
Division of Librarianship, Emory University

Group Reports:
Personnel—Philip Ogilvie
Education—Mrs. Annette H. Phinazee
Specialization—Dale Barker
Cooperation—Mrs. Frances Cheney

Conference Summary: Miss Sarah R. Reed
Library Education Specialist,
U. S. Office of Education

S 73

Appendix

A REGIONAL PLAN FOR LIBRARY EDUCATION

by

Louis Shores
Florida State University

(Pre-conference thinking for the Group 4 Meetings of the Atlanta Conference on "Library Education in the South; April 20-22, 1967)

Pending next steps by our *Commission on a National Plan,* I propose a *Commission on a Regional Plan* for the nine states of the Southeast (and Louisiana of the S.W.L.A., if it will join us) in the tradition of our S.E.L.A. innovations for the nation in the past.

"Telegraphically", the following explorations are suggested as foundations for a regional plan:

1. *A "State Plan"* approach, based on the precedent of the *Southeastern States Cooperative Library Survey,* 1946-47 (edited by Louis R. Wilson and Marion A. Milczewski), with special attention to emerging state plans for higher education, into which Library Education should fit.

2. *Librarianship's Role,* with a bolder look at our professional potential, and the possibility that *Library* 21, for which we must now prepare the next generation of librarians, will be fortified by

   a. A "Library Art" discipline as "substantive" as any we have diffidently played "ancillary" to.
   b. Unmatched approaches to world problems of peace, mental health, delinquency, etc.
   c. A new *Gestalt* for frustrating specialisms.
   d. A means for studying the whys of the universe more pertinent than the scientific method.

3. *Manpower needs,* state by state, quantity and quality, with particular attention to the tasks now performed by professionals and that might as effectively and more economically be performed by technicians and clericals.

4. *Articulation* — next step. (Recall, our Region led the nation with the first articulation conference in 1941; since, there has been only refinements of the Southeast's anticipation of A.L.A. accredited undergraduate non-accredited programs. But new dimensions call out for attention:

   a. *Levels of Library Education* to match manpower needs:
      (1) Professional master's (5th college year; A.L.A. accredited)
      (2) Professional Bachelor's (4th college year; N.C.A.T.E.-ALA approved)
      (3) Semi-Professional A.A. (Junior College Technician; L.E.D. not approved.)
      (4) Professional Post-Master's (6th college year; Georgia certification, e.g.)
      (5) Professional Doctorate (7th college year; 9 programs, none in this region).
      (6) Non-Professional Lay Education. (K-6, 7-12, college, adult, graduate literature searching, teacher library education).
   b. *Peripheries,* to consolidate into a unified profession with opportunities for specialisms
      (1) Audio-visualism (for Educational Media, Materials, Learning Resource Centers).

(2) Information Science (for Technical Information Centers)
(3) Archivism (for Archives Collections)
(4) Curatorships (for museums, etc.)
(5) Library Types (for academic, public, school, special libraries).

c. *Extensions*
(1) Off campus instruction
(2) Inter-institutional offerings within a state system of higher education, residence folklores of accrediting agencies notwithstanding.

5. *Curriculum*
a. Old subject revisions and consolidations.
b. New subjects, for example, *Media, Information Science, Comparative Classification.*

6. *Faculty*
a. Cooperative recruitment
b. In-service education

7. *Students*
a. Cooperative recruitment
b. Counselling
c. Cooperative placement

8. *Housing*
a. A separate building
b. Remodeling library locations

9. *Finance*
a. Per student cost
b. Faculty salaries
c. Materials and services

10. *Innovation*
a. The independent study trend and implications
b. Cooperative work study
c. Practice-education exchange
d. Curriculum areas
e. Off campus instruction

CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH
April 20-22, 1967

List of Participants

Miss DeLois Allen
Polk Junior College
Bartow, Florida 33820

Dr. Lawrence Allen
Head
Department of Library Science
University of Kentucky

Miss Wilma J. Anderson
Assistant Professor of Library Science
Fort Valley State College
Fort Valley, Georgia 31030

Dr. Dale Barker
Systems Analyst, Science Librarian
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30601

Mrs. Elise Barrette
Director
Library Science Department
East Tennessee State College
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601

Mr. Cecil P. Beach
Librarian
Tampa Public Library
Tampa, Florida 33602

Mr. Daniel Bergen, Chairman
Department of Library Science
University of Mississippi
University, Mississippi 38677

Miss Martha Berhel
Librarian
Bethune-Cookman College
Daytona Beach, Florida 32015

Mr. Hank John Blasick
Librarian
Mobile Public Library
Mobile, Alabama 36602

Miss Cora Paul Bomar
Director
Educational Media
Library and Instructional Materials Services
State Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601

Mrs. Hallie B. Brooks
School of Library Service
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Miss Nancy T. Burge
Chairman
Library Science Department
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Miss Leontine Carroll
School of Library Service
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Mrs. Frances Cheney
Library School
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Sister Marie Christine, S.B.S.
Xavier University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70125

Mr. John Clemons
Division of Librarianship
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Mrs. Mary L. Cleveland
School of Library Service
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Miss L. Zenobia Coleman
Librarian
Tougaloo Southern Christian College
Tougaloo, Mississippi 39174

Sister Mary Concepta, S.B.S.
Xavier University
New Orleans, Louisiana 70125

Mr. Binford Conley
Librarian
Alabama A. and M. University
Huntsville, Alabama 35807

Sister M. Consuelo
Head
Library Science Department
Ursuline College
Louisville, Kentucky 20402

Mr. James Cookston
State Supervisor of School Libraries
State Department of Education
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Miss Emily Copeland
Head
Department of Library Science
Florida A. and M. College
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Mrs. Dorothy Crosland
Librarian
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia 30332

Mrs. Mozelle B. Cummings
Head of Field Services
Alabama Public Library Service
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Miss Lura Currier
Mississippi Library Commission
Jackson, Mississippi 39174

Miss Nancy Jane Day
Supervisor of Library Services
State Department of Education
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Mrs. Madeline Dixon
Library
Savannah State College
Savannah, Georgia 31404

Mrs. Florence Duke
Head
Library Science Department
Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia 23803

Mrs. Paralee G. Dupree
Professor
Department of Library Science
Benedict College
Columbia, South Carolina 29204

Miss Annie L. Etchinson
Staff Librarian
Headquarters, Third U. S. Army
Fort McPherson, Georgia 30330

Mrs. Billie N. Finlay
Assistant Professor of Library Science
Madison College
Harrisburg, Virginia 22802

Dr. Stuart Forth
Director of Libraries
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

Mrs. Pauline Foster
Chairman
Department of Library Science
University of Alabama
University, Alabama 35486

Mr. Hoyt Galvin
Librarian
Public Library of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

Mr. Nicholas Gaymon
Librarian
Dillard University
New Orleans, Louisiana 70122

Miss Elizabeth Gilbert
Chairman
Department of Library Science
Berea College
Berea, Kentucky 40403

Dr. Robert Gitler
Director
Library School
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Miss Johnnie Givens
Librarian
Austin Peay State College
Johnson City, Tennessee 37040

Dr. Edwin S. Gleaves
Library School
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Mrs. Henrietta Grant
Assistant Librarian
Knoxville College
Knoxville, Tennessee 37921

Miss Helen Hagen
Librarian
Wilmington College
Wilmington, North Carolina 28401

Dr. H. Joanne Harrar
Librarian
Winthrop College
Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730

Mr. Harold E. Holland
Chairman
Department of Library Service
Appalachian State Teachers College
Boone, North Carolina 28607

Dr. W. Stanley Hoole
Librarian
University of Alabama
University, Alabama 35486

77

Mrs. Clare Houghton
Department of Library Science
Richmond Professional Institute
Richmond, Virginia 23220

Mr. Ray Hummel, Jr.
Assistant Librarian
Virginia State Library
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Mrs. Julie V. Hunter
School of Library Service
Atlanta University
Atlanat, Georgia 30314

Dr. Mary Hymon
Librarian
Grambling College
Grambling, Louisiana 71245

Sister M. Ignatia
Librarian
Berry College
Miami, Florida 33161

Mr. Miles Jackson
Librarian
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

*Mr. John Hall Jacobs
Librarian
Atlanta Public Library
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dr. Gerald Jahoda
Library School
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Miss Sarah Jones
Coordinator of School Library Service
State Department of Education
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Dr. Virginia Lacy Jones
Dean
School of Library Service
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Miss Margaret Kalp
Acting Dean
School of Library Science
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Mrs. Neal Kirin
Wilson Library Bulletin
950 University Avenue
Bronx, New York 10045

*Deceased

Miss Roy Land
Aldermay Library
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

Mr. A. Venable Lawson
Director
Division of Librarianship
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Mrs. Mollie H. Lee
Librarian
Richard B. Harrison Public Library
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Mrs. Ernestine Lipscomb
Librarian
Jackson State College
Jackson, Mississippi 39217

Mrs. Ella B. McCain
School Librarian
Birmingham Public School System
Birmingham, Alabama 35211

Mrs. Odalie McDonald
Supervisor
School Libraries
State Department of Education
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 71245

Mr. Edward McIntosh
Assistant Professor of Library Science
Radford College
Radford, Virginia 24141

Mrs. Patricia McKenzie
Division of Librarianship
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Mrs. Constance H. Marteena
Librarian
Bennett College
Greensboro, North Carolina 27402

Mrs. Bernice B. Middleton
Chairman
Library Science Deparmtent
South Carolina State College
Orangeburg, South Carolina 29115

Mrs. Juanita Miller
Department of Library Science
Albany State College
Albany, Georgia 31705

Miss Alta Millican
Chairman
Department of Instructional Media
Jacksonville State University
Jacksonville, Alabama 36265

Mrs. Jean Moister
Emory University
Division of Librarianship
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Mrs. Florrinell Morton
Director, Library School
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Mr. Walter Murphy
Flintriver Regional Library
Griffin, Georgia 30323

Mr. Philip Ogilvie
Librarian
North Carolina State Library
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Mr. James O'Rourke
Librarian
Kentucky State College
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Mr. Donald Polk
Department of Library Science
Tennessee Technical University
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

Mrs. Lucretia J. Parker
Librarian
School of Library Service
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Mrs. Mary Alice Parsons
Miami-Dade Junior College
Miami, Florida 33167

Miss Juanita Phillips
Department of Library Science
Eastern Kentucky State College
Richmond, Kentucky 40475

Dr. Annette H. Phinazee
School of Library Service
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Mrs. Barbara Lockett Pickett
Reference Department
Louisville Public Library
Louisville, Kentucky 40203

Miss Evelyn Pope
Acting Dean
School of Library Service
North Carolina College
Durham, North Carolina 27707

Dr. Agnes Reagan
Division of Librarianship
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Mrs. Hazel Richmond
Wilson Library Bulletin
950 University Avenue
Bronx, New York 10045

Mr. Benjamin Roberts
Department of Library Science
Palm Beach Junior College
Lake Worth, Florida 33460

Mrs. Carrie C. Robinson
School Library Consultant
State Department of Education
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Miss Dorothy E. Ryan
Head
Department of Library Service
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

Miss Virginia Satterfield
Division of Librarianship
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Miss Rezina Senter
Head
Library Science Department
Murray State College
Murray, Kentucky 42071

Mr. Robert Severance
Director
U. S. Air University Library
Maxwell Air Force Base,
Alabama 36112

Mrs. Camille Shade
Librarian
Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70807

Dr. Louis Shores
Dean
Library School
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Mr. Irvin Simpkins
Science Librarian
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

Mr. Wendell W. Smiley
Director
Department of Library Science
East Carolina College
Greenville, North Carolina 27834

Dr. Alice Smith
Department of Library Science
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

Dr. Jessie Smith
Librarian
Fisk University
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Mr. Robert N. Smith
Library
Woman's College of Georgia
Milledgeville, Georgia 31061

Dr. Frances Lander Spain
Director of Library Services
Central Florida Junior College
Ocala, Florida 32670

Mrs. Dorothy Stevens
Department of Library Education
Alabama State College
Montgomery, Alabama 36101

Mr. Edwin C. Strohecker
Chairman
Department of Library Science
Catherine Spalding College
Louisville, Kentucky 40203

Mr. William Summers
Librarian
Florida State Library
Supreme Court Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32303

Mr. Cyril Sykes
Librarian
Indian River Junior College
Fort Pierce, Florida 33450

Mrs. Thelma Sun Tai
School of Library Service
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Mrs. Josephine Thompson
Atlanta University
School of Library Service
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Miss Sara Tyler
Director of Library Services
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101

Mrs. Gwendolyn Walker
Library Science Department
Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70813

Miss Margaret Walker
Library Consultant
State Department of Education
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Mrs. Barbara Warren
School of Library Service
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Dr. Ruth White
Director
Department of Library Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30601

Miss Clarica Williams
Assistant Professor of Library Science
Morehead State College
Morehead, Kentucky 40351

Miss Doris B. Wilson
Department of Library Science
Jackson State College
Jackson, Mississippi 39217